



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

교육학석사학위논문

Other-Repair in Korean Learners'

English Conversation

한국인 학습자의 영어 대화에서 나타나는
타인 수정

2014년 2월

서울대학교 대학원

외국어교육과 영어전공

송 자 영

Other-Repair in Korean Learners'

English Conversation

by
Jayoung Song

A Thesis Submitted to
the Department of Foreign Language Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts
in English Language Education

At the
Graduate School of Seoul National University

February 2014

Other-Repair in Korean Learners'

English Conversation

한국인 학습자의 영어 대화에서 나타나는

타인 수정

지도교수 오 선 영

이 논문을 교육학 석사 학위논문으로 제출함

2013년 12월

서울대학교 대학원

외국어교육과 영어전공

송 자 영

송자영의 석사학위논문을 인준함

2014년 1월

위 원 장 _____

부위원장 _____

위 원 _____

Other-Repair in Korean Learners'

English Conversation

APPROVED BY THESIS COMMITTEE:

ORYANG KWON, COMMITTEE CHAIR

JIN-WAN KIM

SUN YOUNG OH

ABSTRACT

This study explores the characteristics of other-repair in L2 conversation between Korean learners outside the classroom with a special focus on conditions under which it occurs and the patterns it involves. By looking through the non-native speaker conversation and the sequences on repair, the main interest here is the question of what is special about the way Korean non-native speakers (NNSs) manage the troubles in their talk-in-interaction. It mostly focuses on the repair completed by the “other,” but in order to reveal its basis, it will include investigation of self-repair as well.

The study analyzed audio-recorded conversations of 8 non-native speaker–non-native speaker dyads that totaled approximately 300 minutes. The data were closely examined to determine what actually happens during repair in a data-driven way, applying conversation analysis as a method.

First, the findings of this study confirm that NNS conversation shows a preference toward self-repair found in native speaker (NS)–NS and NS–NNS conversations. In order to determine the preference of NNS participants, self- and other-repair initiation and its completion were analyzed. Repair initiation showed a similar pattern as that of NS conversation. However, regarding its completion, both self-initiated and other-initiated repair were frequently completed by “other” due to the failure of self-completion. In addition, they showed that repair by other was usually delayed as long as possible—to the point where the trouble-source speaker displayed difficulty in managing the turn or asked for help implicitly or explicitly.

Second, the study reveals the characteristics of other-repair, especially the one that incorporates both initiation and completion in a single component. Two types of a single-component other-initiated other-repair were evident in the data. The participants did other-

repair in an embedded or exposed way. In an embedded other-repair, they designed their correction not to highlight the error of their counterpart. In an exposed other-repair, they overtly provided repair and showed the identity of an expert. They addressed gaps in language competence, and throughout the repair sequences, opportunity for learning and actual learning were confirmed. Exposed or overt other-repair did not occur frequently, and it happened in a constrained and distinctive context. It happened in situations where the participants' knowledge of a specific field was presented.

Finally, this study investigated the development of subsequent turns after two different types of other-repair. Throughout the examination, the repair uptake did not depend on who initiated repair. Both repairs resulted in various types of post sequences. They were accepted, repeated, and sometimes rejected. In self-initiated other-repair, participants' identities as an expert or novice became relevant when the recipient completed the repair and the trouble-source speaker accepted it. The participants' language proficiency was not always related with their identities. In other-initiated other-repair, especially in the case of overt single-component other-initiated other-repair, the participant's expert identity was not easily relevant to the counterpart, regardless of their language proficiency.

The findings of the study demonstrate the value of NNS–NNS talk by showing how they are normal and natural as NS–NS or NS–NNS talk. It will also provide foreign language teachers with better understanding on how learners deal with difficulties in talk-in-interaction. In addition, the teachers can help learners raise their awareness of repair and enhance their ability to combine repair effectively in conversations.

Key words: non-native speaker, repair, conversation analysis, L2 conversation outside the classroom

Student number: 2008-21567

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Necessity and Purpose of the Study	1
1.2 Research Questions.....	5
1.3 Organization of the Study	5
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Conversation Analysis Methodology and Second Language Acquisition	7
2.1.1 Traditional CA for Native speaker Data	8
2.1.2 CA for Second Language Acquisition	10
2.2 Repair in Conversation Analysis	13
2.2.1 Definition of Repair and Preference Structure of Repair	13
2.2.2 CA Studies on Repair in Non-native Speaker Data.....	18

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY.....	28
3.1 Data Collection Procedure.....	28
3.2 Data Analysis	30
3.2.1 CA Methodology	30
3.2.2 Analytical Procedure.....	32
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	34
4.1 Preference for Self-Repair in NNS talk.	34
4.1.1 Self-Initiated Repair and Its Completion.....	35
4.1.1.1 Placement.....	35
4.1.1.2 Trouble-Sources and Devices	39
4.1.1.3 Completion of Self-Initiation of Repair	45
4.1.2 Other-Initiated Repair and Its Completion.....	53
4.1.2.1 Placement.....	53
4.1.2.2 Trouble-Sources and Devices	59
4.1.2.3 Completion of Other-Initiation of Repair	63
4.2 Characteristics of Other-Initiated Other-Repair in NNS talk.....	64
4.2.1 Embedded Other-Initiated Other-Repair	65
4.2.2 Exposed Other-Initiated Other-Repair.....	68
4.3 Development of Subsequent Turns after Other-Repair	73
4.3.1 Subsequent Turns of Self-Initiated Other-Repair	74
4.3.2 Subsequent Turns of Other-Initiated Other-Repair	81

CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION	87
5.1 Summary of the Findings and Pedagogical Implications.....	87
5.2 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Study.....	91
REFERENCES	93
APPENDIX	100
국 문 초 록.....	102

LIST OF TABLE

Table 3.1 Data Description	29
----------------------------------	----

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The present study attempts to explore the characteristics of other-repair in L2 conversations between Korean learners outside the classroom with a special focus on conditions under which it occurs and the patterns it involves. This chapter introduces the present study regarding its necessity and purpose, research questions, and organization. Section 1.1 presents necessity and purpose of the study. Section 1.2 introduces research questions. Finally, Section 1.3 details the organization of the study.

1.1 Necessity and Purpose of the Study

Language learners' conversation is assumed to involve a relatively large number of errors and problems due to their limited command of the language. The interactional practice of correction has been searched as one of the factors influencing language learning opportunities in the Second Language Acquisition field. In SLA research tradition, the examination of the learner's production is mostly conducted via experimental settings to prove certain hypotheses quantitatively. With the tradition and the method, it is difficult to examine non-native speakers' (NNS) negotiation and interaction process in a spontaneous situation. There is a need to demonstrate what is happening in NNSs' discourse systematically in order to have a better understanding of their use of the target language.

In a mean time, Conversation Analysis (CA) is a data-driven and empirical approach developed by a few ethnomethodologists in the 1960s and 1970s. They use

detailed transcripts to make observations and ask “Why this now?” to determine what was happening in the interaction.

In the CA approach, correction or any action that deals with troubles in speaking, hearing, or understanding is called “repair.” Repair is not limited to errors or replacement. According to Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), repair can address any kind of problems; therefore, nothing is excludable from the “reparable” class. In that sense, it is different from the concept of negotiation meaning in SLA, which is limited to error correction or communication clarification due to the learner’s linguistic errors (Wong, 2000). Repair can be initiated by either the speaker of the problematic talk or another speaker. The actual repair can then be carried out by the speaker of the problematic talk or the other speaker. Thus, four different types of repair are possible: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair.

In CA, the majority of the previous studies dealt with data including native speakers (NS); the principles of repair also focused on NS data. According to the studies of Schegloff et al.(1977), a fundamental structure in repair sequences exists in NS conversations: a preference toward self-repair. Other-repair is not preferred to self-repair and highly constrained in their place of occurrence. Several pieces of evidence show a preference for self-repair. However, they assert that it is exceptional when the conversation involves a not-yet-competent speaker, such as in an adult–child interaction. Therefore, a number of studies on other-repair were done in interactions with non-native speakers. Although the preference for self-repair proposed by Shegloff et al. (1977) is widely accepted as a fundamental idea, some researchers have reconsidered and

elaborated upon the notion (Norrick, 1991; Firth, 1996; Hosoda, 2000; Kurhila, 2001).

They made efforts to disclose the basis of other-repair with different subjects and focuses. In particular, research on second-language speaker conversations contributed to the thought that NNS talk involves “normal” conversations in which the fundamental methods of conversational organization found in NS conversations also operate (Firth, 1996; Hosoda, 2006).

The current study adopts the same analytical stance as previous studies. By looking through the NNS conversations and the sequences on repair, the main interest here is the question of what is special or different about the way in which Korean NNSs manage the troubles in their talk-in-interaction. This study focuses primarily on the repair completed by the other, but in order to reveal its basis, the study includes investigation on the self-repair as well.

Most previous research use data relates to NS–NNS, as it focuses on second-language conversations. However, in foreign language learning contexts, the NNS–NNS combination is much more common. It is frequently seen in classroom pair activities and outside the classroom as voluntary language practice. For foreign language learners, the opportunity to engage in a conversation with native speakers is very rare. In this learning context, NNS–NNS interaction can be a useful alternative; in fact, it is widely practiced by learners who want to improve their target language proficiency. This study is designed to use data from non-experimental, non-pedagogic, and voluntary language practice between learners who share the L1.

Not only are there few studies on NNS–NNS conversations, but no prior research has focused on the other-repair of NNSs from the same language background.

One reason for this might be that CA is a study that prefers naturally occurring data. Conversation among NNSs who share L1 is in fact far from an authentic situation. Moreover, most researchers study a second-language context focusing on NS–NNS data.

The fact that both speakers are L2 learners with the same L1 is an important difference in the study of repair as it could affect the approach to repair somewhat differently when compared to other types of conversation. The main concern here is to identify the patterns and conditions of other-repair in Korean learners' talk. Might other-repair occur in a less constrained circumstance? Under which conditions does a participant choose to correct the interlocutor's turn? In NS–NNS conversations, participants orient to each other's identity as a novice or an expert through repair activities (Hosoda, 2006). Could this be adopted in the NNS–NNS conversation according to participants' language proficiency?

To answer these questions, this study first concerns the matter of preference structure, which includes an analysis on self-repair to determine whether they show the same preference. Second, it describes other-repair, which is categorized as exposed other-repair and embedded other-repair according to the method of realization. The repair sequences are analyzed using a micro-analytic approach in terms of its placement, trouble-source, and form. In addition, the study manages the issue of language expertise and its relevance with other-repair. As language learners, do they orient to their language expertise as an expert or as a novice? Finally, the development of subsequent turn—that is, repair recipients' response to other-repair—is explored. Do they repeat the repair? If not, what comes after the repair? Do self-initiated other-repair and other-initiated other-repair result in different kinds of uptake? Is the uptake of other-repair

related with participants' orientation toward language expertise? These questions are addressed in this study.

By closely examining what actually happens during repair in a data-driven way and applying conversation analysis as a method, the study of other-repair in NNS talk will provide foreign language teachers with a better understanding of how to deal with learners' difficulties.

1.2 Research questions

By examining naturally occurring English conversation among Korean learners, the current study is designed to investigate the characteristics of other-repair. The main concern is, therefore, the conditions under which other-repair occurs. Specifically, the study aims to answer the following three questions.

- 1) Do evidences exist to support the preference for self-repair in NNS–NNS conversation? What are the evidences?
- 2) When and how do the participants choose to repair the prior speaker's turn (in terms of the composition of the turn, position of the turn, types of trouble-source, participants' language proficiency)?
- 3) How does the other-repair influence the subsequent turn? Is the uptake of other-repair related with participants' orientation toward language expertise?

1.3 Organization of the Study

The study is organized as follows. Chapter 2 reviews the CA studies in general

and introduces relevant studies on repair in NS–NS and NS–NNS conversations. Chapter 3 details the methodology used in this research, the data-collection process, and the procedure for analyzing the data. Chapter 4 presents the findings on the preferences and conditions of other-repair. Chapter 5 provides a summary of the study and its implications. Finally, the limitations and suggestions for further studies are discussed.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews previous literature of Conversation Analysis, especially focusing on repair and non-native speaker data. Section 2.1 presents overall background on the traditional CA using native-speaker data and development of CA for Second Language Acquisition. Section 2.2 deals with some basic concepts in repair and studies on repair using various data.

2.1 Conversation Analysis methodology and Second Language Acquisition

Starting from native speakers' mundane conversations, Conversation Analysis now has its interest on analyzing non-native speaker data and provides information which was not available in the previous SLA researches. Section 2.1.1 will presents background on the traditional CA, and section 2.1.2 will presents the studies of CA for SLA.

2.1.1 Traditional CA for Native speaker Data

Conversation Analysis is a very “powerful methodology to uncover how the social world is constructed by means of interaction” (Brouwer, 2004). It was started by sociologists Sacks and Schegloff as a sociological “naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of social action rigorously, empirically and formally”

(Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). It takes ordinary conversation to be “the fundamental form of talk-in-interaction” (Schegloff, 1987b) and insists on using mundane conversations of native speakers, which are collected from naturally occurring talks in actual interaction.

In analyzing its data, CA analysts approach from an emic perspective (Pike, 1967). There is a distinction in anthropology between what are called emic and etic descriptions. Emic perspective is a way of looking at language and social interaction from a member’s perspective. Pike (1967) developed this term and explained that “descriptions or analyses from the etic standpoint are ‘alien’ in view, with criteria external to the system. Emic descriptions provide an internal view, with criteria chosen from within the system. They represent to us the view of one familiar with the system and who knows how to function within it himself”.

What distinguishes CA from other emic approaches is that, for CA, the insider’s perspective is not obtained by interviewing the speakers, but by uncovering how the participants treat each other’s talk in the details of interaction (Wong & Waring, 2010). Starting from this stand point, the CA researchers begin with collecting data. The recorded data is transcribed finely, using CA’s tradition developed by Gail Jefferson. For analyzing talk-in-interaction, it is important to write down not only what has been said, but how it has been said (ten Have, 2007). Thus, there are many symbols that can describe various kinds of elements that consist the talk. Those symbols include speakers’ pauses, sound stretches, stress, pitch, pace, and volume as illustrated in the appendix. Incorrect pronunciation is not corrected; therefore, some of the unconventional spellings can be found in common CA transcripts.

With the data, analyzing, the most essential parts of “doing CA” starts. It is called

“unmotivated looking (Psathas, 1995)”, which involves initially examining the data without any assumption or hypothesis. Throughout the observations, the question of “why that now?” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) must be answered. The researcher should carefully examine how the participants treat the certain talk in the flow of interaction. By answering the question, some cases catch the researcher’s interest, and then, one can develop an analysis or build an argument.

With these procedures, CA describes various kinds of organizations that operate in ordinary conversations including turn-taking organization, preference organization, and repair organization. These are the most basic types of organization in CA.

First, turn-taking organization describes the features of environment for talking and acting-in-interaction. Through turns at talk, actions that speaker intend to accomplish get done. It provides the answer for the question of how one comes to have a turn and to act with it. The building blocks for turns are called turn-constructual units, or TCUs. A speaker beginning to talk in a turn has the right to produce one TCU, and it can realize one or more actions. When a speaker approaches the possible completion of a first TCU in a turn, transition to a next speaker can become relevant. At the transition-relevance place, the prior speaker can select the next speaker or anyone can self-select to take the next turn. The first pair part serves to select someone as next speaker to do second pair part by making certain responses relevant to its action. Likewise, turn-taking organization is composed of this central format – the adjacency pair.

The notion of preference issues from the organization of the adjacency pair. Preference is not related to the notion of psychological liking or wanting, but rather

indicates issues of affiliation and disaffiliation. Schegloff (2007) explains that preferred actions are normally delivered without hesitation or delay at the start of the response turn. Dispreferred responses are mostly accompanied by hesitation and delay and frequently mitigated in some way and accounted for by an explanation or excuse of some kind.

Repair organization involves the treatment of troubles in talk. Trouble is anything that can impede their communication and nothing is in principle, excludable from the class “repairable” (Schegloff et al., 1977). It is a vital mechanism for the maintenance of intersubjectivity and will be discussed in 2.2 with details.

2.1.2 CA for Second Language Acquisition

The field of second language acquisition has reconfigured itself since the late 1990’s and Firth and Wagner (1997) have been influential in the transformation. In their article, they criticized the then “mainstream” SLA research, which had predominantly presented cognitive and mentalistic orientations, and called for the reconceptualization of the fundamental notions that are central to the field, including language, discourse communication, acquisition and use, and native and nonnative speakers. They did so by taking the perspective clearly rooted in the CA tradition. Their major components of the reconceptualization of SLA were (a) a significantly enhanced awareness of the contextual and interactional dimensions of language use, (b) increased emic sensitivity towards fundamental concepts and (c) the broadening of the traditional SLA data base. Their claim has triggered strong interest in the potential of CA for analyzing L2 talk. A number of publications have introduced studies that apply CA to various kinds of L2

data. These studies, however, have been criticized as incomplete to directly answer the questions that are related with the main concern of SLA- the question about learning. It is not an easy task to connect CA with the question of learning, since CA studies are mostly concentrated in the domain of social interaction and social orders that are displayed through interaction. In order to provide evidence of language learning, extended interactions and longitudinal data are required. Despite the limitation, CA for SLA is meaningful in that it reveals the special traits in NNS talk with emic point of view.

For example, Wong (2000) examined the token 'yeah' in the speech of NNS speakers of English whose native language was Mandarin. She revealed that the token 'yeah' occurring in their talk was not just for repair but it served an additional component. The use of 'yeah' was to present an image of the speaker as one who was competently managing throughout disfluency. Its use was more likely to be deployed by nonnative speakers because they ran a greater risk of being perceived as having limited command, experience, and knowledge of the language. Thus they might have felt greater interactional pressure to counter the perceptions in NS-NNS conversation.

Similarly, Carroll (2004) also presented a study showing special characteristics of NNS talk. She focused on the restarts in beginning level of NNSs' talk and argued that those false starts might not be a reflection of their non-nativeness but a useful resource to get TCU(turn-constructural unit) beginning right.

These studies dealt with non-native speakers' conversation with native speakers, which took place in an ESL context. Later on, CA study of NS-NNS interaction in non-pedagogic settings has broadened to include the CA study of interaction between NNS

and NNS using English or other language as interactional lingua franca talk as Schwartz (1980), Firth (1996), Wagner (1996), Mondada (2004), and Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh (2004).

On the other hand, a different aspect of problem occurs from the CA side of view on using NNS data. In an interview with Wong & Olsner (2000), as one of the founders of conversation analysis, Schegloff admitted that non-native talk was a sub-area in the study of talk-in-interaction. However, he cautioned that there might be a danger of insisting ‘non-nativeness’ with ones’ data. Researchers need to be very careful not to look at the data as “native-nonnative” unless something in the data requires to. How nonnative speakers are “doing being” nonnative speakers must be shown by the participants’ orientations in the data.

Regarding the issue, identity problem of non-native speakers has been one of the topics frequently drawn researchers’ interests. How interactants orient to their ‘nativeness’ or ‘non-nativeness’ as a relevant factor in the interaction, and how it is achieved interactionally are the questions asked by many researchers. A dichotomous treatment of the NS/NNS identity, which is prevalent in SLA is criticized by CA researchers for taking the dichotomy for granted and called for a deeper understanding of language learners as social beings.

For example, Kurhila (2004) studied conversation between first language and second language speakers in institutional settings in Finland. She found out that the participants’ identities were being dynamic, denying the thought of the speaker identity as being a fundamental, omnirelevant category. The native speakers were not eager to adopt the role of the linguistic expert, and non-native speakers brought learner identity

into interactional focus almost always by him or herself. Instead of being the expert and novice, both sides oriented to their institutional role and tasks combined with that role.

Kasper (2004) observed NS and NNS conversation for learning German, and examined how the interlocutors oriented to membership categories. She argued that participants were not only etically imposed analytical categories, but rather they made different participation statuses relevant through their interactional conduct.

Park (2007) examined discursive practices through which NNS identity was constituted in relation to NS identity. She proposed that NS/NNS identities were social categories that were made procedurally relevant to the ongoing interaction and that invoked an asymmetrical alignment of the participants. They negotiated their NS/NNS identities by aligning and realigning each other and the invoked identities often underwent renegotiation. The findings indicated that a local asymmetry between an NS and an NNS was not merely an external constraint on participants' discursive conduct but also provided resources for moving the interaction ahead.

2.2 Repair in Conversation Analysis

Section 2.2.1 will review the nature and organization of repair and section 2.2.1 will show how repair sequences were analyzed and presented in the previous studies using non-native speaker data.

2.2.1 Definition of Repair and Preference Structure of Repair

'Repair' in conversation analysis deals with any problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding. In the phenomena addressed in CA, "repairable" is not limited to error or

replacement. The repairable is called ‘trouble-source’, which is a word, phrase, or utterance treated as problematic by the participants. It is noticeable that a trouble-source must be treated by the participants. If a grammatical error is not oriented by the participants, it is not a repairable.

Repair sequence usually consists of two segments – initiation and completion (or outcome), and the terms such as ‘self-repair’ or ‘other-repair’ refer to the success of a repair procedure. There are four types of repair. First, when speaker of the trouble source both initiates and completes the repair, it is called self-initiated self-repair (SISR). The following is the example of self-initiated self-repair.

Excerpt (1) (From Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 364)

01 N: → She was given me a:ll the people that were go:ne this
02 → yea:r I mean this quarter y’//know
03 J: Yeah

In the excerpt, the speaker N produces wrong expression ‘year’, and immediately initiated repair by adding ‘I mean’ + the correct word. This is a typical example of self-repair issued from self-initiation.

Second, when speaker of the trouble source initiates the repair, but other participants carry out the repair completion, it is called self-initiated other-repair (SIOR). In the following example, the speaker B has trouble coming up with a person’s first name. The listener A completes the repair by saying ‘Dan Watts’.

Excerpt (2) (From Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 364- modified)

01 B: He had dis uh Mistuh W-whatever k- I can't think of his
 02 first name, Watts on, the one that wrote that piece,
 03 A: →Dan Watts.

Third, when the recipient of the talk initiates the repair and the speaker of the trouble source completes the repair, it is called other-initiated self-repair (OISR). In the excerpt (3), Dan gives affirmative answer to Ken's question. However, the other interlocutor Roger in line 4 raise a question about Dan's answer and laughs. So, the repair is initiated by Roger in line 4, and completed by Dan in line 5, which clarifies his prior answer.

Excerpt (3) (From Schegloff at al., 1977, p. 364- modified)

01 Ken: Is AL here today?
 02 Dan: Yeah.
 03 (0.2)
 04 Roger: → He is? hh eh heh
 05 Dan: → Well he was.

Lastly, when the recipient of the talk both initiates the repair and completes it, it is called other-initiated other repair (OIOR). Consider the following excerpt.

Excerpt (4) (From Schegloff at al., 1977, p. 365- modified)

01 B: Where did you play ba:sketball.
 02 A: (The) gy:m.
 03 B: In the gy:m?

04 A: Yea:h. Like Grou(h)p therapy. Yuh know, half the group
05 that we had las:t term was there and we jus' playing arou:nd.
06 B: →Uh-fooling around.
07 A: Eh- yeah...

The speaker A is describing how she played basketball with the other students using the expression 'playing around'. The listener B corrects the expression with a different verb, and by producing the term right away, she is doing both repair initiation and its completion with in the same turn.

According to Schegloff et al. (1997), self-initiated repair and other-initiated repair exploit different techniques to locate trouble source. Self-initiation usually exploits non-lexical perturbations, whereas other-initiation directly or indirectly locates the trouble source. In terms of the position of repair initiation turn, generally they are launched in the same turn or the next turn. Among the four types of repair, there is a preference toward self-repair.

Moreover, the same research by Schegloff et al. (1977) explicated the mechanism where self-repair predominates over other-repair. It is summarized as (i) opportunities for self-initiation come before opportunities for other-initiation; the recipient withholds the repair initiation until the current speaker reaches at the possible completion of the turn; (ii) other initiations regularly are withheld a bit past the possible completion of trouble source turn; (iii) while self-repair overwhelmingly combine locating the repairable and doing a candidate repair, other-initiations overwhelmingly yield self-corrections by locating the trouble source. Since the opportunity available to other to initiate repair is used to afford speaker of a trouble source a further opportunity to self-

repair, it is concluded that although there is a distinction between self-correction and other-correction, they are not alternatives.

Unlike other-initiation of repair, whose occurrence is unrestricted in its proper position (next turn), other-correction is highly constrained in its occurrence. When other-correction occurs its form is frequently modulated and is downgraded on a 'confidence/uncertainty' scale. One common modulation is Y mean X, where X is a possible correction or replacement word. Also, it may be used to check understanding. In the modulations, other-correction is not asserted, but is proffered for acceptance or rejection. Unmodulated other-correction occurs mostly in the turn after an understanding check or a modulated other-correction. In addition, other-correction is frequently associated with other interactional actions such as disagreement. So, the highly constrained occurrence of other-correction proves its dispreferred status.

This preference structure was later challenged by Norrick(1991), who argued that asymmetrical ability to accomplish the action accounts for the organization of corrections. With respect to conversation involving non-native speakers, there are some works showing that similar or slightly different preference might operate. For example, Hosoda (2000) aligned with the 'preference structure' of repair and focused on the conditions where other-repair occurs and the response to other-repair in natural NS-NNS conversations in Japanese.

Kurhila (2001) sought to explain the issue of selection in correction with asymmetrical conversation between native speakers and non-native speakers in Finnish. He approached the question of the selection in correction with a sequential point of view, through which NS-NNS conversation can be explained with interactional locus of the

error.

In the meantime, Wong (2004) presented some evidences that could support the preference of self-repair in NS-NNS talk. She focused on the delays of uptake by NSs, which could provide an opportunity the NNS to continue his or her talk, talk that might clarify the prior error.

2.2.2 CA Studies on Repair in Non-native Speaker Data

Repair bears the closest connection with language pedagogy because teachers do correction and help students with misunderstandings, and it is an important component of one's interactional competence (Wong & Waring, 2010). In Wong and Olsner (2000), Schegloff argued that the organization and structure of repair is the same in nonnative talk. Even though various instances of repair look different because the parts that comprise an episode of repair- such as how to do its initiation, how to do the repair proper, how to do its aftermath may differ depending on the linguistic inventory of the language being deployed by the speakers, its basic principle is the same.

In fact, many second language researchers working in the tradition of CA have been interested in examining the formats and functions of repair in talk including NNSs. The sustained assumption is that when shared linguistic resources are limited, mutual understanding may be at an increased risk, requiring more repair work from participants in order to manage their joint activities (Kasper & Kim, 2007).

Thus, there have been various CA researches on repair in non-native speaker conversation (Firth, 1996; Wong, 2000; Kurhila, 2001; Kasper, 2004; Hosoda, 2006; Kasper and Kim, 2007). Firth (1996) started his research from the question whether

CA's findings were equally as applicable in lingua franca interactions as they were in the analysis of monolingual talk. He used institutional talk of Danish speakers of English and their international clients. Throughout the work, what he argued was that lingua franca talk was not only meaningful, but also "normal" and, indeed "ordinary". He focused on the concept of "letting-it-pass", which meant that the hearer let the unknown or unclear action, word or utterance "pass" on the assumption that it would either become clear or redundant as talk progressed.

In the following extract, the Dane, H, is talking to B, a Syrian. It can be observed in line 2~3, where B's use of the term blowing is unknown to H, though initially he lets it 'pass'.

Extract (1) (from Firth, 1996, p. 244 –modified)

- 01 B: I told him not to uh:: send the:: cheese after the (.) the
02 blowing (.) in the customs.
03 (0.4)
04 B: We don't want the order after the chesse is uh: (.) blowing.
05 H: I see, yes.
06 B: So I don't know what we can do with the order now. What do
07 you think we should uh do with this is all blowing Mister
08 Hansen.
09 (0.5)
10 H: I'm not uh (0.7) blowing uh what uh, what is this uh: too
11 big or what?
12 B: No, the cheese is bad Mister Hansen.
13 (0.4)
14 B: it is like (.) fermenting in the customs' cool rooms.

15 H: Ah, it's gone off.

16 B: Yes. It's gone off.

It is shown that the participants, regardless of their different cultural membership or varying linguistic ability, may act as if they understand one another. Moreover, the participants sometimes engage in the task more actively in an attempt to make sense of what is being done and said. When faced with the other participant's marked lexical selections, the hearer behaves in such a way as to divert attention. By doing other-repair, they make the other's "abnormal" talk appear "normal". "Letting-it-pass" or "making-it-normal", though they are not unique only in such interactions, can be part of the interactional competencies that non-native speakers bring to their interaction.

Inspired by Firth (1996), Kasper and Kim (2007) developed the study into the question of how the passing up of repair, or handling of inapposite responses was deployed in conversations designed for language practice. Using the data of student-organized activity, where German students of English met with a bilingual German and English, they noticed that misunderstandings of NNS did not seem to be taken as such by the expert speakers. There were many instances where the non-native speaker misconstrued the previous turn, specifically in answer turns to questions. It was the place where third-position repair could be placed. Third-position repair is an attempt to fix the trouble-source by its speaker based on the next speaker's response. Consider the following excerpt.

Excerpt (2) (From Kasper & Kim, 2007, p.27- modified)

01 NS: How do you go to school in the morning?

02 NNS: yeah.

03 NS: No, I mean how you get to school.

Rejection of understanding displayed in line 3 is the example of third-position repair. But in the data, it is rather very common for the native-speaker recipient of the answer not to address the misunderstanding in an overt manner. On some occasions the response turn does get a repair, but it is delayed and realized in a next turn repair initiation rather than a third-position repair.

Excerpt (3) (From Kasper & Kim, 2007, p. 34 –modified)

01 NS: Do you like watching TV?

02 (0.6)

03 NNS: hm:, (1.2) Everwood? [I guess.

04 NS: [hm?

05 (0.6)

06 NNS: I watch Everwood.

07 (2.1)

08 NS: What's that?

09 NNS: Everwood? It's a (0.3) programme.

10 NS: aha:: (.) comedy?

In the excerpt, non-native speaker's inapposite response in line 3 does not get a repair right away. The recipient passes up the chance to repair, which serves to sustain the current line of talk and keep the non-native speaker participant actively engaged.

Wong (2000), on the other hand, examined other-initiated repair which was delayed within next turn position produced by non-native speakers of English whose

native language was Mandarin. She found that other-initiated repair by NNS participants occasionally did not occur in the next turn relative to the trouble-source turn, which was a predominant place of other-initiation in NS conversations. The NNS participants delayed other-initiation of repair within the next turn as in excerpt (4).

Excerpt (4) (Wong, 2000, p. 250)

01 NS: I'm just so tired. I think I'll close my eyes just- I'll
02 just take a short nap.
03 (0.4)
04 NNS: Mm hmm.
05 NS: I woke up at eleven o'clock.
06 NNS: tchwow!
07 (0.4)
08 NNS: You works the whole night?

The non-native speaker here produces an assessment 'tchwow!' before uttering the repair initiator in line 8, and between them there is a pause in line 7. The talk displays that non-native speaker analyzes turn twice; once in next position, and once at the delayed position. Repair-initiations delayed within next turn can be found in NS data as in Schegloff (2000), but it is different in several observations. See the following excerpt.

Excerpt (5) (Schegloff, 2000, 178)

01 A: Is shorty there?
02 B: Ooo jest- who?
03 A: Eddy?

04 A: Wood[ward
05 B: [Oo jesta minnit.

In the NS data, an initial segment preceding the other-repair initiation is abandoned, and it is usually a cutoff item as in line 2. There is no gap of silence in pre- other-repair initiation position, and also there is a sense of disjunction between the two. Wong analyzes that unlike NS's delayed next turn other-repair initiation, which shows a sense of speaking 'prematurely', NNS's indicates a sense of speaking 'late' than the speaker ought to have spoken. So it can be considered as 'not-yet-mature' understanding in the case of non-native speakers. In doing so, they construct and reveal their identities as talkers and learners.

Another research for repair in NS-NNS is Kurhila (2001), which is mentioned in the previous section. The paper explained the issue of repair selection in conversation between native speakers and non-native speakers. Kurhila approached the question of the selection in correction with a sequential point of view, through which NS-NNS conversation could be explained with interactional locus of the error, that is, in terms of the kinds of repairs that could be done and the kinds of environments where the deficiencies occurred. Kurhila suggested that other-correction was observed to occur frequently in asymmetrical conversation, but was constrained. One environment where the deviations recurrently were corrected by the NS was the turn subsequent to a hesitant-framed turn by the NNS. That is, the NSs did corrections after the NNSs had displayed uncertainty about their utterance formulation. Grammatical deviations by the NNS were most likely to be corrected by NS when they occurred in a 'repetition slot' or when they could be treated initiating repair. It was not independent of the preference

organization by Schegloff et al. (1997) in that these corrections were embedded actions. However, they were outright repair without giving the NNS an opportunity to do self-repair. There are several reasons underlying the greater frequency of outright other-repair over initiating repair. For example, initiating repair requires the recipient to be able to correct the error with necessary knowledge or information, but in NS- NNS talk the NNS's position of knowledge cannot be taken for granted. In addition, side-sequences postpone achieving the goal of the interaction. If it is in a classroom setting as in McHoul (1990), other-initiated self-repair might be more frequent.

A closely related issue with repair in NS and NNS conversation is the matter of orientations toward language expertise. Kasper (2004), Kurhila (2004), Hosoda (2006), and many others also investigated L1-L2 conversation and found out when and how the speakers displayed their orientation to their language expertise through the repair activity.

Kasper (2004) conducted a research on a dyadic conversation-for-learning between a beginning learner of German as a foreign language and a native speaker of German. She used institutional data, which was participated by NS of German and learners of German who was given instruction to have 20 minute sessions of conversation. She analyzed participant orientations toward social membership categories and found out that although the membership categories of target language novice and expert were omnirelevant in the setting, they were predominantly invoked by the novice, and only on particular occasions.

Similarly, Hosoda (2006) focused on other-repair as one sequential environment where the participants recurrently oriented to their differential linguistic knowledge. The

study provided evidence that differential language expertise bore no relevance for the speakers during most of their talk, which reinforced the notion that second language conversations are just as normal conversations as that of first language.

Up to now, researches regarding repair work including non-native speaker have been explored. These previous researches on repair are mostly concerned with non-native-speakers talk and their characteristics that are revealed in an interaction with native speakers. Even though the focus and subjects of the studies vary, it is the same as in native-speaker data that the basic rules of conversation are deployed by the participants, and therefore, they prove the normality of non-native speaker talk.

The remaining question here is whether the talk between NNS-NNS would still be “normal” as NS-NNS talk. Until now, there are a few researches on NNS-NNS talk itself, not to mention researches on their repair sequences. Schwartz (1980), Firth (1996), Wagner (1996), Mondada (2004), and Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh (2004) are examples of NNS-NNS talk using English or other language as a lingua franca. Schwartz (1980) supports the observation made by Schegloff et al. (1977) that there may be an exception to the otherwise restricted appearance of other-correction in NNS-NNS talk. On the contrary, Firth (1996) focuses on the characteristics of lingua franca talk which is not only normal but also ordinary. Mondada (2004) and Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh (2004) reveal characteristics of lingua-franca talk focusing on plurilingualism and the logic of word clarification respectively. These are meaningful work on NNS-NNS conversation in an ESL context. Currently, most of the researches that analyze NNS-NNS talk are either focusing on classroom talk (Wagner 2004, Seedhous 2004, Lee 2008, Park 2013) or dealing with NNS-NNS talk, whose analytical

tool is not CA, but quantitative method of SLA (Varonis & Gass, 1983; Colina & Mayo, 2009; Fujii & Mackey, 2009).

Therefore, it is obvious to say that CA research for NNS talk has been largely confined to NS-NNS discourse. But, what happens in the NNS-NNS talk could be different from the NS-NNS talk. This study is designed to focus on conversations between the same L1 background non-native speakers in a non-pedagogical setting, practicing English voluntarily as a foreign language.

The characteristics of data examined in the current research are different from the most of the previous ones. It is not a classroom setting, task-based, nor experimental. Most of all, the data is unique in that the speakers have their first language in common, and their goal of conversation is not only to interact, but to practice the target language for their own sake. The circumstance where the talk occurs is partly institutional in a sense that they have an educational purpose of having a conversation, but it is voluntary and natural at the same time. This study will focus its main interest on the characteristics of repair, especially other-repair, in Korean learners' English conversation. In their talk-in-interaction, would the speakers show the same preference structure and do other-repair just as naturally as they do in a conversation with a native speaker? Can we validate other-repair in NNS-NNS talk as normal? Throughout the analysis on repair, the characteristics of the NNS-NNS talk using the same L1 will be also naturally uncovered. The result will help language teachers to decide whether they should encourage students to utilize it as a way of practicing the target language.

As the previous research on NS-NNS talk has revealed the normality and uniqueness of their talk, the current work is also to certify the value of NNS-NNS talk

and find out whether it complies with the findings in the former researches.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the data collected and methodology of the study. Section 3.1 describes the data collection procedure and the participants of the study. Section 3.2 introduces the basic concepts and the nature of conversation analysis and provides the analytical procedure of the research.

3.1 Data Collection Procedure

The data of this study are collected from 16 adult female and male Korean learners of English who did not have regular curriculums in English-speaking countries. The participants are friends, co-workers, or family members who engage in regular or irregular English conversation practices for their own purposes, resulting in 8 NNS–NNS conversation dyads, amounting to approximately 300 minutes. Participants' ages vary, ranging from the early 20s to the mid-30s. The data were audio-recorded in 2011 and 2012 during participants' voluntary gathering for English-speaking practice without the presence of the researcher. Topics were neither assigned nor suggested, so that the participants autonomously managed their conversation. The participants were classified into four categories—beginner, intermediate, high intermediate, or advanced—based on their TEPS or TOEIC scores. In order to apply equal standards, TOEIC scores were converted into corresponding TEPS scores using the TEPS–TOEIC–TOEFL conversion table. Beginners' scored under 550, intermediates between 551 and 700, high intermediates between 701 and 800, and advanced participants over 800.

TABLE 3.1
Data Description

	Name of Data Set	Participants ¹ /Gender/Proficiency/TEPS score	Length ² (min)
1	Library	Minjun/male/advanced/ 920 Kyomin/male/intermediate/856	30
2	Café	Dongsu/male/advanced/ 815 Heejae/female/beginner/516	35
3	Study room 1	Misun/female/advanced/850 Sungil/male/high-intermediate/790	30
4	Study room 2	Yumi/female/high-intermediate/750 Sangmin/male/advanced/ 839	40
5	Seminar room 1	Dojin/male/high-intermediate/776 Taekhyun/male/high-intermediate/783	45
6	Seminar room 2	Youngmin/male/high-intermediate/736 Eunmi/female/advanced/ 842	60
7	At home	Insu/male/advanced/816 Jaein/female/advanced/870	25
8	Meeting room	Huykjae/male/advanced/870 Haesu/female/advanced/901	30
	Total		300

¹ Participants' names are pseudonyms.

² Times are rounded off.

3.2 Data analysis

This study employed Conversation Analysis as a methodology. Section 3.2.1 will introduce some of the basic concepts in CA methodology which will help understand the current study. Section 3.2.2 will provide details of analytical procedure of the study.

3.2.1 CA Methodology

Conversation analysis is a unique way of analyzing language and social interaction. It was developed in the early 1960s in California by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. CA's main interest is in what people do in order to have a conversation. In order to understand CA methodology, there are several important concepts to be explained. First is turn-taking organization. CA uses the term 'turn' as a unit of analysis. The basic unit of a turn is the turn-constructive unit, or TCU, and it is a word, a phrase, a clause, or a sentence that completes a communicative act (Wong & Waring, 2010). Turn-taking organization describes the features of environment for talking and acting-in-interaction. Through turns at talk, actions that speaker intend to accomplish get done. A speaker beginning to talk in a turn has the right to produce one TCU, and it can realize one or more actions. When a speaker approaches the possible completion of a first TCU in a turn, transition to a next speaker can become relevant. At the transition-relevance place, the prior speaker can select the next speaker or anyone can self-select to take the next turn. The first pair part serves to select someone as next speaker to do second pair part by making certain responses relevant to its action. Likewise, turn-taking organization is composed of this central format – the adjacency pair. Every utterance is doing actions and each turn at talk shows how the speaker

understands what the prior turn is doing and projects the relevant subsequent actions to be performed by another speaker in the next turn. The notion 'projectability' comes from this process, and it allows the next speaker to expect the possible completion of the prior turn. Turn-taking organization also enables the researchers to have access to participants' understanding of talk and development of intersubjectivity (Schegloff, 2007).

Second important component of CA is called 'Sequence organization', which refers to ways of initiating and responding to talk while performing actions such as agreeing, disagreeing, inviting, requesting, or storytelling etc. In sequence practices, an adjacency pair is a building block, just like a TCU is in turn taking organization. An adjacency pair consists of two turns spoken by different speakers, the first one as first pair-part, and the second one as second pair-part. According to Schegloff (1968), the first pair-part makes the second pair-part conditionally relevant. For example, 'inviting' first pair-part will make 'acceptance' or 'refusal' conditionally relevant. What follows this sequence organization is preference structure. Usually, the actions conveyed by both the first and second pair-part have different status; some are preferred than any other one. The preference here is not psychological liking or disliking, but what is natural or expected in the sequence.

Along with the concepts explained above, another important aspect of CA is its approach to data. CA uses a highly detailed transcript as data. The transcript shows elaborate aspects of language use including silence, overlap, intonation, loudness, pitch and speed. Those might seem insignificant, but they convey a lot of information on what happens during the talk-in-interaction. CA favors naturally occurring data rather than

‘experimental’ or ‘researcher provoked’ ones, because it considers talk-in-interaction as a ‘situated’ achievement rather than as a product of personal intentions that can be manipulated in a laboratory it is therefore less ‘artificial’ (ten Have, 2007). The data enables CA to take an ‘emic perspective’, which is a term developed by Pike (1967). It is a way of looking at language and social interaction from an ‘insider’s’ perspective. CA researchers repeats listening and transcribing throughout the work and try to answer the question “why that now?” by stepping inside the shoes of participants. When the analyst finds interesting and regular interactional practice to develop an argument, they examine other transcripts from other participants. Any deviant cases that do not fit into the argument need to be treated carefully, because they can provide a basis for reconsidering the existing argument or they can also be a case for a different interactional practice (Wong & Waring, 2010).

3.2.2 Analytical Procedure

First, the recorded conversations were transcribed by using the transcription conventional method originally developed by Gail Jefferson (ten Have, 2007; see the transcription convention in appendix.). Second, the researcher examined the transcribed data without any pre-established expectation.

In the course of analysis, it needs to be conducted from ‘emic’ perspective. What is important is not dependent on what the researcher think is important but on the participants’ understanding and interpretation of what is going on. Following the given steps, with unmotivated looking, the researcher found some aspect of the talk which recurred with a pattern, and ‘other-repair’ was selected as the main interest of this study.

After transcribing the whole data, sequences in which repair occurred were transcribed with more details. Korean words were respelled using Yale Romanization system with an equivalent English translation.

Even though the main focus of this study is in other-repair, it was necessary to see all the other types of repair in order to answer the question of preference. So, repair sequences were categorized into four types- SISR, OISR, SIOR, OIOR. Each of the repairs was analyzed from various aspects. First, it was examined in terms of turn-taking; whether it occurs in the same turn, turn transition place, next turn, or third turn. Second, form of the initiation and correction such as word search, use of lexical perturbations, repetitions, change in intonation and stress was observed. Third, the types of trouble source, whether they were caused by understanding problems, grammar errors or vocabulary use, were checked. Lastly, each other-repair sequence (SIOR and OIOR) and its subsequent turn development were examined. Throughout the process, the researcher also considered whether the interlocutors oriented to the differences in their proficiency on linguistic knowledge, which is included in the research question.

CHAPTER4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to answer the research questions detailed in Chapter 1, this chapter analyzes and discusses the characteristics of repair sequences of Korean learners' English conversation, focusing in particular on other-repair. First, to determine the preference for self-repair in their talk, self- and other-repair initiation and their completion are examined. Other-initiated other-repair, which is known to be rather frequent in learner talk, is then analyzed in detail to identify differences or similarities in NNSs' talk when compared with previous studies including NS. Finally, the development of sequences after repair is explored by comparing self and other-repair of NNS talk.

4.1 Preference for Self-Repair in NNS Talk

As revealed in previous studies (Schegloff et al., 1977, Hosoda, 2000), the preference for self-repair is evident in conversations between native speakers as well as between native and non-native speakers. The question here is whether the same preference structure applies in conversations between non-native speakers who share the same first language. As noted in the introduction of this study, usually lingua franca NNS–NNS talk involves frequent repair due to the lack of a shared background (Varonis & Gass, 1996). In the data used in this research, Korean non-native speakers use English as a means of communication, but they have a specific goal to achieve in their

English conversation—namely, to enhance their target language proficiency. There might be a possibility of more frequent other-repair or no preference toward self-repair because of this specific purpose. To facilitate learning, it can be assumed that they might be more willing to repair each other's troubles. In order to reveal their preference, both self-initiation and completion must be examined. Self-initiated repair can be either completed with self-repair successfully or completed with other-repair if the self-repair fails. Not only can these two types of repair provide evidence for the preference, but other-initiated repair completed by the self can also prove it. The two different types of repair are analyzed in this section.

4.1.1 Self-Initiated Repair and Its Completion

Schegloff et al. (1977) provided evidence related to self-repair, such as i) other-repairs do not come early, and ii) other-repair initiation only locates troubles when self-repair initiation usually comes with the repair. In this section, self-initiated repair is examined in terms of its placement, trouble-source, devices, and completion to compare with other-initiated repair and learn about the preference.

4.1.1.1. Placement

In excerpts (1) through (3), the place of self-initiation of repair can be identified. Self-initiated repairs have four main types of positions, as demonstrated in the research of native speakers' mundane conversations in Schegloff et al. (1977). First, they can be placed within the same turn as their trouble-source. Second, they can be placed in the turn's transition space. Third, they can be placed in the third turn to the trouble-source

turn. Finally, there is a place called the third-position, where a repair is attempted based on the next speaker's response.

Excerpt (1) [Seminar room1] (Same turn)

01 → Taekhyun: I- uhm, I have a very specific- So distincti-distictable
02 **distinctive-**
03 Dojin: Distinuishful
04 Taekhyun: Ah, distinguishful character.
05 Dojin: Yeah, yeah, she like that.

Excerpt (2) [Study room1] (Turn's transition space)

01 Misun: If you get up at three.
02 Sungil: Mm.
03 Misun: And watch the soccer game.
04 (0.2)
05 Misun: Heh[:::: How will you-
06 → Sungil: **[I think ok- it's not fun. >It will not fun<. It will**
07 **not fun.** Because [we=
08 Misun: [it will not fun.
09 Sungil: =will lose, we will lose.
10 Misun: We will lose. I can see that.

Excerpt (3) [At home] (Third turn)

01 Insu: Because, that is- ah, that is not related to ma- my major.
02 Jaein: Ah::.
03 Insu: Because I'm just personally,
04 Jaein: Ah::
05 Insu: I'm interested in-mm- make the computer.
06 Jaein: Ah::
07 → Insu: **NOT the make a computer, tune the computer.**
08 Jaein: Ah::Okay.

As shown in the excerpts, the self-initiation of repair can happen relatively freely as the speaker of a trouble-source has the right to continue his or her turn. In line 1 of excerpt (1), Taekhyun initiates repair by trying to think of a suitable expression (i.e., “distinguished”). This kind of word replacement is common in both native and non-native conversations. Self-repair can also be initiated in a turn’s transition space, as in excerpt (2). In line 6, Sungil’s turn “I think ok—it’s not fun” is quickly followed by the speech “It will not fun.” The transition space is an environment in which a turn can reach its possible completion. Sungil continues and repairs the prior turn, which ultimately prevents a possible transition by Misun. Finally, excerpt (3) shows the self-initiation of repair, which occurred in the third turn. Insu’s remark in line 5 seems to have no problem, but he corrects himself by choosing a different expression.

The final type of self-initiated self-repair is third-position repair (Schegloff, 1992b), which is an attempt by the speaker to fix the source of the trouble based on the next speaker’s response. The response displays a possible misunderstanding of the trouble-source turn, so there is a need to negotiate meaning. The difference between third-turn repair and third-position repair is that the next turn in the third-turn repair does not display any problem, but the next turn in the third-position repair elicits correction by the first speaker. In the following example from Schegloff (1987b), speaker A treats B’s line 1 as a complaint by offering an excuse at line 5. Speaker B initiates a third-position repair in lines 6–7, denying that she was complaining in line 1.

Excerpt (4) [Schegloff, 1987b, p. 208-209, modified] (Third-position)

01 B: Well, honey? I’ll probably see you one of these day:s,
 02 A: Oh:: God yeah,
 03 B: [Uhh huh!

04 A: [We-
 05 A: But I c- I just [couldn't get down [there.
 06 → B: [Oh- [Oh I know,
 07 I'm not asking [you to [come down-
 08 A: [Jesus [I mean I just I didn't have five
 minutes yesterday.

Likewise, third-position repair in native speakers' conversation is mostly caused by a misunderstanding of the trouble-source turn. NNS's third-position repair is caused by the same reason, but often handled differently. Consider excerpt (5):

Excerpt (5) [Study room 2]

01 Yumi: So, what- what are you supposed to do after watching movie.
 02 Do you any plans for (0.2) today?
 03 Sangmin: Having dinner,
 04 → Yumi: **Oh the- the- movie finish that line,**
 05 Sangmin: Four?
 06 Yumi: Four or five?
 07 Sangmin: Yeah?
 08 → Yumi: **So, before you have dinner, do you have any plans?**
 09 Sangmin: Let's go to some cafeteria? And talk about the movie thing?
 10 Yumi: Oh:: just yeah, just we can do our stuffs?
 11 Sangmin: Okay.

Yumi asks Sangmin what he is going to do after watching the movie. Yumi does not specify the time she is referring to, which causes Sangmin to interpret the time differently. In line 4, Yumi initiates third-position repair to inform Sangmin that she is talking about the few hours of free time they will have after watching movie. After reminding him of this fact, she naturally continues her repair in line 8, which makes her

question clearer. She does not use the “I mean x” type of repair, but her repair is handled tacitly so that Sangmin’s misunderstanding is not highlighted. The result is similar to the findings from Kasper and Kim’s (2007) research involving American university students learning German. In their results, native participants use “covert” third-position repairs so as not to shine the spotlight on the trouble-source in a direct manner.

4.1.1.2. Trouble-Sources and Devices

Self- and other-initiated repairs deal with the same trouble types (Schegloff et al., 1977); however, some types are overwhelmingly initiated by the speaker him- or herself. When grammar errors are made and repaired, repairs are usually initiated by speaker of the trouble-source, and never by others. In fact, many occurrences of grammar correction in this data were initiated by the trouble-source’s speaker, as shown in excerpts (6) and (7).

Excerpt (6) [At home]

- 01 Jaein: Do you have problems?
02 Insu : The- the- the Yeah, I- I made problems in speaking English,
03 but the most important thing is I don’t afraid.
04 Jaein: Ah[:
05→ Insu: **[I’m not afrai[d.**
06 Jaein: [Ah::: you’re not afraid o[f-
07 Insu: [I’m not
afraid to speak English.

Excerpt (7) [Meeting room]

- 01 Hyukjae: [I think I’m expert on that.
02 Haesu: Oh:: ah haha.

03 → Hyukjae: **If you have problem, why don't you co[me, come asks- ask**
 04 **me.**
 04 Haesu: [Oh.

In excerpt (6), Insu and Jaein are talking about Insu's English use in his work environment. When Insu makes a mistake by treating the adjective "afraid" as a verb and using the ungrammatical "don't," Jaein does not orient to it. In line 4, she reacts with a stretched "Ah::," a Korean expression which seems to have a similar function as the English word "oh," showing that the talk to which it responds is informative to the recipient (Heritage, 1984b). Insu's following turn partly overlaps with Jaein's "Ah::," which shows that he was in a hurry to get the floor for his turn and initiate self-repair of the grammatical error. Thus, it is corrected by the speaker himself and becomes the third-turn self-initiation of repair. As she is a non-native speaker, it cannot be ensured that Jaein notices the error. It can only be assumed that she knows it and lets it pass, especially considering line 6, where she seems to know the exact use of the expression "be afraid of." Jaein even rephrases Insu's repair in the second-person point of view.

Excerpt (7) also displays self-initiated self-repair of a grammatical error, but the placement is in the same turn. Hyukjae corrects his mistake in the use of the third-person plural -s; it happens quickly, with a cut-off sound after the grammatical error. Surprisingly enough, repairs of grammatical errors are never overtly highlighted by the other anywhere in the data. When grammatical errors occurred, they were all dealt with by the speaker him- or herself initially. The interlocutor can help the completion of grammar correction, but they never initiate the repair.

Another type of trouble-source is a word search, which is overwhelmingly

common in the current data. According to Brouwer (2003), word searches are considered to be remarkable with regard to second-language learning interactions because they can constitute crucial moments in the learner's acquisition. Excerpt (8) shows a word search practice between Sangmin and Yumi.

Excerpt (8) [Study room 2]

01 Sangmin: I mean, the managerial accounting, it's just for one's
02 manager.
03 Yumi: Uhm.
04 Sangmin: For company's manager.
05 Yumi: Uhm.
06 Sangmin: So it's only for the manager. It's (.) just report for
07 the manager.
08 (.)
09→Sangmin: **Not for the- ah, reporting (.) the co-compa-ri- tch>how**
10 **can I say< it- not for the information which is open to**
11 **the public.**
12 (1.5)
13 Yumi: Reall[y?
14 Sangmin: [Yeah, that's the,
15 Yumi: Managerial accounting?
16 Sangmin: Yea[h

Sangmin is trying to explain the concept of “managerial accounting,” but he has difficulty coming up with suitable expressions. In line 4, Sangmin's explicit word search marker “how can I say” is produced with compressed speed. As in Brouwer (2003), this kind of explicit word search marker might have the form of a question, but does not regularly get an answer from an other speaker. In this case, Yumi does not get enough information about the item searched for, so she is not able to help Sangmin, who has also not indicated an invitation for help. Sangmin's quicker speech is evidence that he is

trying to continue his turn and complete what he wants to describe by himself. Brouwer points out that the speaker who wants help from the hearer has to do specific work to make it clear that he or she needs the other to participate in the word search and also has to provide enough information about what is being searched for. In Sangmin and Yumi's case, the topic involves a specific term that requires professional knowledge, so Yumi does not participate and lets Sangmin do his repair.

However, self-repair initiations for a word search usually get help from the interlocutor in the data of this research. Not only for the word search, but also for other types of trouble-sources, the speaker shows typical patterns that signal he or she is engaging in repair initiation. When a current speaker experiences troubles and initiates self-repair, he or she usually shows some symptoms that foretell the troubles they are having. Thus, the repair initiation is accompanied by some non-lexical perturbations, pauses, or repetitions. These are the initiator techniques or devices common in self-repair. They are common phenomena in native speakers' conversation (Schegloff et al., 1977), and the same applies in these data. They are shown in excerpt (9), where Taekhyun is doing a word search.

Excerpt (9) [Seminar room 1]

- 01 → Taekhyun: **Ah yeah, that is the-that is the good side of-good side-**
02 Dojin: One of the good side?
03 Taekhyun: Yeah, one of the good side. That is important.

Taekhyun's line 1 shows cut-offs and repetitions, which signals to Dojin that he is engaging in repair for a word search. It is the most frequent pattern of self-initiation of repair, which eventually invites the interlocutor to provide help. The completion of the

repair will be examined with more detail in the next section.

Along with cut-off, pause, and repetition, rising intonation is also an initiator of self-repair. Although these devices indicate difficulties indirectly, some of the repair initiations are direct requests for help. In excerpt (10), Heejae and Dongsu are talking about plans for dinner.

Excerpt (10) [Café]

- 01 Heejae: Ahm: mom asked to me.
02 Dongsu: Yes.
03→ Heejae: **Asked to me? [Ast me?**
04 Dongsu: [Ah ha ah ha
05 Heejae: What is right? A[sked to me, asked me, how, how, how, wou-
06 Dongsu: [asked me
07 Heejae: How you dinner together? How hav- have- [How about-
08 Dongsu: [How
09 How about having [dinner?
10 Heejae: [Having a dinner tonight?
11 Dongsu: Ah hah.

Heejae successfully does her first turn, but she is not sure about using the preposition “to.” Her second turn, which includes repetition and rising intonation, overlaps with Dongsu’s response in line 4. Heejae’s line 3 is self-initiation and at the same time an inserted first pair part, which requires Dongsu’s help as a second pair part. But because of the overlap, there is a chance that Dongsu did not hear the last part of Heejae’s prior turn. Not getting the expected second pair part, Heejae directly asks Dongsu which one is right in the next turn. After getting the answer from Dongu, Heejae continues with her previous topic, which also induces Dong’s help (lines 7–10).

Code-switching is one of the common ways that non-native speakers in the data use repair initiation devices. In excerpt (11), Kyomin has a problem coming up with a proper expression for “concern.”

Excerpt (11) [Library]

- 01 Kyomin: I hav- I have a *gomin*.
02 Minjun: Huh, okay.
03→Kyomin: **What's the *gomin* in English?**
04 Minjun: Concern?
05 Kyomin: Uh, I have a concern, that is the my sho- is-

What is interesting here is that not all code-switching practices are used as a repair initiation device or considered as a repair initiation by the interlocutor. When the current speaker starts a repair initiation with code-switching, he or she combines other evident devices to it, so the other speaker notices that they are having a trouble. Code-switching in NS–NNS conversations usually makes the word search sequences longer (Lee, 2008). In this data, however, the speakers share the same first language and have no problem understanding the meaning of the code-switched word. Therefore, in NNS–NNS talk, if there is no evidence of difficulty, code-switching can be considered a communicative strategy for the interlocutor. In his study on L1 use in a Korean EFL classroom, Lee (2008) found that the use of L1 helps learners accomplish their presented task more effectively and talk in-depth without encountering communication breakdowns. In excerpt (11), Kyomin uses the Korean word “*gomin*” (“concern”) in line 1, and Minjun does not treat it as a repair initiation. “Okay” in Minjun’s line 2 means “go ahead.” But in line 3, Kyomin explicitly requests help by asking “what’s the *gomin* in English?”

Although they have no problem understanding, they go through repair sequences. This indicates that the purpose of this kind of NNS–NNS conversation is learning the target language. The completion of self-repair initiation involving different kinds of code-switching will be discussed more deeply in the next section.

4.1.1.3. Completion of Self-Initiation of Repair

It is essential to scrutinize the result of the self-initiation of repair. In native speaker data, self-repair initiation usually contains repair completion by the self, while other-initiation only locates the trouble-source (Schegloff et al., 1977). Yet the common pattern of completion of self-initiation is somewhat different in several ways in NNS data. Three different patterns are found in the data.

First is self-repair initiation, which is completed by the self. Excerpts (2), (3), (6), and (7) are examples of the case. It usually accompanies a rather short pause or less perturbation and, therefore, reaches its completion fast. However, due to their lack of language proficiency and especially their weakness in vocabulary, speakers' self-initiation is frequently lengthened, as shown in excerpts (1) and (9). They only locate the place they are having problem with and do not successfully complete the repair by themselves. The common pattern is that the devices shown above signal their repair initiation and the other speakers intervene and complete the turn instead. This is the second pattern of self-initiation of repair found in the data. Completion by others only occurs when the other person has enough information to guess the item being repaired. Sometimes the other interlocutor does not have the solution that the prior speaker is looking for, so the completion of repair is not successful, but usually completion by

others provides appropriate help. This happens a lot more in word searches than in any other kinds of troubles. The current speaker initiates repair through various kinds of devices, which results in other-repair, as shown in excerpt (12).

Excerpt (12) shows a common example of self-initiation in a word search, where Yumi and Sangmin are talking about what to have for lunch and Yumi is explaining why she is not hungry.

Excerpt (12) [Study room 2]

- 01 Yumi: No, actually whenever I: ah, have coffee?
02 Sangmin: Ah.
03→ Yumi: **My, like hungriness?**
04 Sangmin: Ah,
05 (.)
06 Sangmin: Hunge[r?]
07 Yumi: [my] hunger,
08 (0.2)
09→ Sangmin: **Disappear?**
10 Yumi: Disappear. So,
11 Sangmin: Really?
12 Yumi: I don't feel like hungry.

Yumi initiates self-repair through rising intonation and the adjective “like” in line 3. Her demonstration of uncertainty elicits Sangmin’s repair on the incorrect use of the word “hungriness.” Yumi repeats the correct word that Sangmin provides, but it takes time for her to continue and finish the sentence. There is a short pause at line 8, and at that moment, Sangmin takes the turn and completes Yumi’s turn by guessing the word that Yumi is looking for. The silence serves to indicate Yumi’s difficulty finding a word.

There is no verbalized self-initiation of repair, but still the absence of the repaired item prompts the other interlocutor to intervene—that is, a pause that comes before the transition relevance position can be a factor that establishes the environment where the other completes the repair. Interestingly, Sangmin’s acts of repair completion in both cases take the form of a confirmation check with an accompanying rising intonation. His completion gets confirmation from Yumi’s repetition. Throughout these interactions, they make up their incomplete proficiency and co-construct the conversation.

Another example of a word search inducing other-repair is seen in excerpt (13). Youngmin and Eunmi are having a conversation about different kinds of food they like. Here, the trouble-source speaker’s self-initiation of repair is an implicit sign to elicit the other participant’s repair. The other is not directly invited, but rather she volunteers actively in the process of repair.

Excerpt (13) [Study room 2]

- 01 Eunmi: I’m interested in the western cooking? And also
 02 Asian cooking.
 03 Youngmin: Mm hm.
 04 Eunmi: But, I don’t like African food.
 05 Youngmin: Ah: Uh::
 06 Eunmi: I don’t know about that, Culture. Actually.
 07 Youngmin: I don’t know about African food, either.
 08 (1.0)
 09→Youngmin: **I don’t know what’s- (0.5) what,hhh.**
 10 Eunmi: what they eat, con- what:: they: consume, °hh I mean::
 11 (0.7)
 12 Youngmin: Uhm::
 13 Eunmi: I mean what African people, people (0.2) eat?
 14 Youngmin: Yes, I don’t know. hh about it.

In line 9, Youngmin has difficulty finishing his sentence, as indicated in the inter-turn gap and his long exhale. Eunmi initiates the repair and tries to complete Youngmin's prior turn, but she also has to self-repair her turn in the process of the other-repair. Eunmi's tries in lines 10 and 13 are evidence that Eunmi is also not fully ready to help and complete Youngmin's turn. Nevertheless, she actively engages in the repair action and succeeds in completing the turn. In addition, Eunmi's repair completion in line 13 ends with a rising intonation, which requires confirmation from Youngmin; this is the same case as in excerpt (12). This shows the uniqueness of NNS talk and also indicates the participants' identity as a language learner. Sometimes this kind of intervention can provide an incorrect repair. Consider excerpt (14):

Excerpt (14)

01 Taekhyun: I- uhm I have a very specific- So distincti
 02 distictable-distinctive-
 03 →Dojin: **Distinuishful,**
 04 Taekhyun: Ah, distinguishful character.
 05 Dojin: Yeah, yeah, she like that.

Dojin's other-repair with an incorrect English word helps Taekhyun finish his sentence. Although it is not correct, Taekhyun repeats the given word. Not all incorrect repair completions get confirmation from the trouble-source speaker. However, this seems to happen quite frequently in the data, as none of the participants are an expert in the target language. The relationship between repair uptake and language proficiency will be discussed in Section 4.3.

Likewise, non-native speakers' repair initiation often fails, and its completion by others might not be perfect or might even be incorrect. Yet it is meaningful that they are interacting in a way they can handle the flow of talk and develop the talk despite their deficiencies. This shows non-native speakers' activeness in managing the talk-in-interactions—in other words, their interactional competence. Although they prefer self-repair, participants would choose repair the other's turn rather than just let the prior turn get lengthened.

The third pattern of completion of self-initiation is found in the place where the repair is designed to prompt other-completion. This kind of self-initiation involves directly asking for help. Consider excerpt (15):

Excerpt (15) [At home]

- 01 Insu: So, is there any regulations or limitations for your paper's
02 thickness? I mean your paper's number of pages.
03 Jaein: I don't think so.
04 Insu: It's up to you.
05→Jaein: **Yeah. I have seen many cases. But you have to have uhm: you know,**
06 **there are like four or five steps? Chapters?**
07 Insu: Sections.
08→Jaein: **Sections, you start with introduction. One of my ah, lap- ahm::**
09 **lap friends? Do you? Ca[11:**
10 Insu: [Lap mate.
11 Jaein: Lap mates? Ye[ah.
12 Insu: [Yeah class ma[te.
13 Jaein: [Yeah. Texted me. Like,
14 Insu: Text you?
15 Jaein: Yeah, like two days ago?

The deciding factor in the completion of self-repair initiation is mostly the current speaker's ability to continue the turn. When a speaker is not handling the turn appropriately or is asking for help—whether implicit or explicit—the other speaker engages in the ongoing talk. Jaein in line 8 of excerpt (15) tries self-initiation several times while displaying difficulties through hesitation and cut-off. Insu's other-repair is delayed as long as possible, to the point where Jaein directly asks for help. This means that the interlocutors usually do not intervene unless it is evident that the current speaker is having trouble or showing an inability to repair.

As briefly mentioned in the previous section, code-switching shows a great example of this phenomenon. There are two kinds of code-switching: one with a rising tone, uncertainty, or direct asking and one without any hesitation. Code-switching with a rising tone or non-lexical perturbation is considered repair initiation by the participants. If code-switching is done without any showing any difficulties, it is most likely not completed by the co-participant. Thus, if the current speaker code-switches without showing problems, it is treated as a compensation strategy and the conversation continues. In her research on non-native talk in oral interviews with native speakers in an institutional setting, Park (2003) argues that code-switching behavior is due to their limited ability to manage discourse and interaction in English. She found lots of code-switched discourse markers used in non-native speakers' speech. As she suspected, Park's result might have been affected by the context of the data, where the use of first language was strictly forbidden. However, code-switching in this research on non-native and non-native talk is mostly found in word searches, used as a compensating strategy for their lack of vocabulary. Excerpts (16) and (17) are good examples.

In excerpt (16), Sungil and Misun are husband and wife; Misun is telling Sungil about the phone call she had with her sister. Misun's sister needed an air conditioner but could not afford it, so Misun thought about giving out their air conditioner, but ultimately she did not offer it because they might need it for their babies. In line 7, Sungil does not know the word “*ttamtti*” (“heat rash”) in English. He uses the Korean word, even pluralizing it, and repairs “many” to “much” as if it were an English word. He successfully substitutes the unknown word with the Korean word. Misun does not show any orientation to the Korean word nor toward initiating the repair, but laughs at his remark.

Excerpt (16) [Study room 1]

- 01 Misun: Then, we will need air con[ditioner, a lot.
 02 Sungil: [Ah:: Yeah.
 03 Misun: But not- not for me [for our babies.
 04 Sungil: [Yes yeah.
 05 Misun: I just thought about it, but I didn't say, hihihihhihihihihi.
 06→Sungil: [Our
 07 **Babies can get many *tta*-much *ttam*-*ttis*.**
 08 Misun: Ahhahahahahaha.
 09 Sungil: hh [without
 10 Misun: [Without air condition[er.
 11 Sungil: [Yeah.
 12 Misun: Eh hehe[hehehe.°hh
 13 Sungil: [hhhe

A similar occurrence of code-switching is demonstrated in excerpt (17). Huykjae is telling Haesu about his position in his family. He does not hesitate to use the word “*maknay*” (“the youngest”); Haesu also does not orient to it.

Excerpt (17) [Meeting room]

01 → Hyukjae: **Two years. So I'm *maknay*.**
02 Haesu: mhm.
03 Hyukjae: I have been playing *mak-nae*. So,
04 Haesu: mhm::
05 Hyukjae: My parents doesn't- don't give that much pressure.

However, in the following two excerpts, the trouble-source speakers show their difficulty and uncertainty through sound stretching and rising intonation, and their code-switching yields other-repair completion.

Excerpt (18) [Café]

01 →Hee-jae: **For dinner together. So I'm::gomin.**
02 Dong-su: `hh ah, you are concerning.
03 Hee-jae: Concerning now.

Excerpt (19) [Library]

01 Kyomin: There's a lot of powlotics, relationship[ps
02 Minjun: [Mm h[m
03→ Kyomin: **[and:: ummo?**
04 (.)
05 Minjun: Conspiracy.
06 Kyomin: Ah, conpare-consparacies, and:: lot of bribes and a lo- a
lot of problems.

Therefore, it can be said that self-initiation of repair by NNS quite often induces repair completion by other NNS, and this other-repair occurs only when the speaker of the trouble-source is experiencing difficulty managing his or her talk and the other notices it. This evidence further supports the conclusion that they prefer the self-

initiation of repair.

Self-initiation resulting in other-repair completion shows evident difficulties, including repetition, failures, and pause, but because of their status as non-native speakers, it is not easy to differentiate the situations in which the interlocutor is not sure what to say or just waits for self-completion. It would require great caution from researchers when analyzing the data.

Although the participants' repair initiation frequently results in other-completion, it does not come early. They wait for the self-repair giving the trouble-source speaker a chance. They are using repair as a tool for meaning negotiation and an effective facilitator of communication. Throughout the repair sequences, they co-construct talk-in-interaction. To keep the conversation moving, the non-native speakers actively and effectively engage in the talk. Therefore, it can be said that repair sequences are co-managed and, thus, allow both participants to contribute to the ongoing talk despite imperfections on both sides.

4.1.2 Other-Initiated Repair and Its Completion

In order to support the evidence of preference toward self-initiation of repair in NNS talk, other-initiated repair also needs to be examined in terms of its placement of occurrence, trouble-source, devices, and finally its completion.

4.1.2.1. Placement

Other-initiation of repair has a different placement in sequences from that of self-initiation. Schegloff et al. (1977) found two important features of other-initiation

regarding its placement. First, it is known to occupy one main position, which is the next turn relative to the trouble-source turn. Second, it does not come early. Others withhold repair initiations from taking place while the trouble-source turn is in progress.

Excerpt (20) [study room2]

- 01 Sangmin: So, which drama have you watched currently?
02 Yumi: Currently? Actually I, I don't, I don' watch soap drama
03 too much?
04 Sangmin: Mm hm?
05 Yumi: Cause, I have to, hhh usually I just watched finished
06 drama,
07 Sangmin: Mm hm.
08 Yumi: Downloaded and just watched it. Witha (.) pars, witha
09 pouse, mm. hh
10→ Sangmin: **Without what?**
11 Yumi: With a (.) pose? °[With a pose?°
12 Sangmin: [with a-
13 Yumi: Without stop[ping?
14 Sangmin: [Ah without stopping.
15 Yumi: Hiu. I don't rike being waited. Waiting something.

In except (20), Yumi is describing how she usually watches downloaded dramas. Her line 8 includes a micropause and repetition before ending with laugh tokens. Her laughing signals that she feels embarrassed by the mistakes she made. Sangmin waits for her to finish the turn and initiates repair in line 10, without joining in her laugh. He partially repeats Yumi's turn, but he does not offer a candidate word. At Sangmin's request for clarification, Yumi responds with uncertainty, trying to repair her pronunciation. Sangmin tries to help by guessing it, which overlaps Yumi's soft voice. Sangmin does not recognize Yumi's repair because it is not her pronunciation that

Sangmin has problem with. In line 13, Yumi changes the word to a different expression, and then Sangmin's next turn starts with "ah," which signals his change of state.

Likewise, other-repair initiation does not come as early as self-repair initiation does. Trouble-source turns are not interrupted to initiate the repair. If this happens, such an interruption is overwhelmingly a self-interruption by the speaker of the trouble-source turn and is rarely by others. In addition, other-repair initiation often conveys disalignment, as in excerpt (21).

Excerpt (21) [Study room 2]

01 Sangmin: But, I don't know, I just want to go to some, ah, southern Europe,
02 which is very, ah, famous about- I mean (0.2) Paris or::
03 (0.2)

04 → Yumi: **Southern Europe?**

05 Sangmin: Southern Europe.
06 Yumi: Southern Europe is Spain, Greece? O[r,
07 Sangmin: [Oh, so where is the PAry then?
08 (1.0)

09 → Yumi: **Paris is lik- uhm, ↑YEah, ah, yeah, it's- ah- western Europe?**

10 Sangmin: Ah yeah. I just[(h) (),hahaha hahaha □hh
12 Yumi: [Eh hahahahahahahahaha
13 Sangmin: I- I, I thought that the 'Suh' (h) as[(hh) southern. Hehehehe □hh
14 Yumi: [hehehehehehehehe
13 Sangmin: Oh my god, eh hehehe[hehehehe.
14 Yumi: [Hihihihihhi[hihi.
15 Sangmin: [Eh hehehehe anyway, hehehehe
I want to go to west- western Europe.

Sangmin uses the incorrect expression "southern Europe" when he refers to "western Europe," including Paris. The inter-turn gap in line 3 is foretelling Yumi's disagreement

with Sangmin's prior statement. Here, the delayed positioning of Yumi's other-initiation displays the dispreferred status of both other-initiation and misalignment.

Although the vast majority of the other-initiation of repairs occurs in the next turn, non-native speakers are sometimes not able to place it immediately after the trouble-source turn. Schegloff (2000) and Wong (2000) discussed delayed occurrences of other-initiation. The main reason for the delayed next turn repair is interpreted as non-native speakers' limited capability on understanding. Interestingly, delayed third-turn repair initiation rarely occurs in the NNS–NNS conversation in these data. In Wong (2000), third-turn repair initiation is possible because the NS retrieves his/her turn to give NNS an opportunity to respond with proper reaction. Consider excerpt (22) and its pattern:

Excerpt (22) [Wong, 2000 – modified]

01	NNS: So when are you going to (.) Boston	
02	NS: tch I'm going to go:: the last uh:: t(h)wo weeks (0.2) of	
03	Jewly	→ NS's talk
04	NNS: Uh huh	→ NNS's receipt
05	NS: tch h so::	→ NS's gap of silence or minimal talk
06	NNS: Oh so you mean jus stay there for two weeks	
		→ NNS's delayed other-repair initiation
07	NS: h (0.2) Y-eah so that I c'n uh: get a job first	

However, in NNS–NNS data, the problem is usually not only caused by the recipient's limited ability to understand; rather, it is more often provided by the speaker of the first pair part. Thus, the recipient can give the first speaker a chance to initiate

self-repair in the next turn. Here, in excerpt (23), Heejae describes someone she knows, saying that the person is a very quiet person who only speaks a lot when drunk. However, she uses “people” instead of “person,” and Dongsu produces the continuer “um” to show his understanding, which is in fact not complete. Heejae’s third-turn self-repair initiation corrects the error, and then Dongsu’s next turn has “oh,” providing evidence of his change of information state (Heritage, 1984b). He also shows his understanding by rephrasing “quiet person.”

Excerpt (23) [Café]

- 01 Heejae: He is very quait people.
02 Dongsu: Um
03 Heejae: Quait person?
04→ Dongsu: **Oh, he does[n’t speak that much?**
05 Heejae: [m Ah, he speak much,
06 Dongsu: Ah hah.
07 Heejae: In- in alko[l?
08 Dongsu: [Ah: when, okay with alcohol he speaks a lot.

Thus, most of the time, the pattern is as follows:

- a) First pair part with a trouble-source
- b) Partial claim of understanding and passing up of an opportunity to do other-repair
- c) Self-repair
- d) Display of understanding

It is possible that Dongsu’s response in line 2 does not necessarily display

understanding. Wong and Waring (2010) claimed that ESL or EFL teachers need to be aware that, when learners produce response tokens such as “yeah” or “mm hmm,” it does not always guarantee their understanding. Dongsu might not have understood Heejae’s prior turn, but in the next turn Heejae takes the floor, which enables her to initiate self-repair.

A delayed next turn other-repair is found in the data, showing a similar pattern as that of the NS–NNS data in Wong (2000). The first pair part is not troublesome, but the recipient’s response is not sufficient. The speaker of the first pair part retrieves her next turn, resulting in a pause. Consider excerpt (24):

Excerpt (24) [At home]

- 01 Jaein: You ↑feel like total stranger to me.
02 Insu: Yes.
03 Jaein: Eh hehehehehe. °hhhh
04 Insu: Most of the people are stranger to my major. Ahahahaha.
05 Jaein: I mean, ah, I- I didn’t mean that.
06 Insu: Ok[ay].
07 Jaein: [I mean, when we speak in Engli[sh and it feels like you’re=
08 Insu: [Ah ha.
09 Jaein: =totally different person.
10 (0.7)
11 Insu: Okay::
12 (0.3)
13 →Insu: **Ah, REAlly?** [Ah ha
14 Jaein: [You- don’t you feel like that?
15 Insu: I don’t feel that.
16 Jaein: Ah, really?

In lines 7 through 9, Jaein tells Insu that she feels Insu is a different person when she

speaks in English with him. After her remark, there is an inter-turn gap followed by Insu's acceptance with "okay." The token "okay" is usually considered to be a receipt/acceptance marker that manages actions such as closing what is proceeding and moving to the next topics (Beach, 1993). By saying "okay," Insu shows his acceptance and signals to Jaein to continue. But acceptance is not a relevant response to Jaein's statement. What is relevant here is a reaction that shows his agreement or disagreement. Jaein does not say anything in the following lines, and there is another inter-turn gap. Insu's line 13 is a delayed next-turn repair initiation. It starts with "ah," which is a corresponding token to the English "oh." Since "oh" signals that whatever was problematic has now been resolved (Heritage, 1984b), it is automatically proof that shows Insu's prior turn in line 11 is not a relevant response. It can also be said that the turn is not indicating his full understanding of what Jaein has said. The excerpt shows a "not-yet-mature" understanding in the case of non-native speakers. In so doing, they construct their identities as interactants who are talkers and learners (Wong, 2000).

4.1.2.2. Trouble-Sources and Devices

The trouble-source of the other-initiation of repair usually involves an understanding of the problems of conversation. Without the other-initiation of repair, the talk can be in a potential danger of resulting confusion. Non-native speakers make errors regarding pronunciation or vocabulary, which then lead to a stalling of the talk in progress. Using NS–NNS Japanese conversation, Hosoda (2006) argued that an L1 speaker offers a solution to the problem when mutual understanding was not achieved because of an L2 speaker's apparent problem of producing a correct lexical item.

Similarly, in NNS–NNS conversation, in order to pursue intersubjectivity, they clarify the conversation by asking questions or engaging in similarly effective activities for getting the information and details correct. It is important to note that grammatical errors are not treated as reparable in the whole data; the reason the participants do not orient to grammar is that the main goal of their talk is to have a conversation. Thus, typical devices for other-repair initiation are wh-interrogatives, partial repetition of prior turn, or clarification questions such as “what do you mean?”, which are known as typical other-repair initiators in native speaker conversation. These techniques are ordered in terms of their power to highlight the trouble-source. The stronger the spotlight gets, the better the trouble-source speaker notices what needs to be repaired (Schegloff et al., 1977). The following example shows a good example of other-initiation of repair using a wh-interrogative.

Excerpt (25) [Study room 2] (Wh-interrogative)

- 01 Yumi: What about you?
- 02 Sangmin: tch, wha[t?
- 03 Yumi: [have you have any plans for,
- 04 Sangmin: Plans for
- 05 Yumi: Febery?
- 06→ Sangmin: **Wha-=-**
- 07 Yumi: =Febery.
- 08→ Sangmin: **What is Febery?**
- 09 (.)
- 10 Yumi: *Iee-Ieewal.*
- 11 Sangmin: Ah, Febura[ry.
- 12 Yumi: [Ehehehe
- 13 Sangmin: Ah, any plans for- for the february. Oh, I can't afford to, like go abroad, actually? Go- go travel abroad.

Yumi and Sangmin are talking about Yumi's plans for the winter vacation. Yumi asks Sangmin a question, but he does not understand what she means by "what about you?" Yumi asks whether he has plans for February, and in line 6 Sangmin initiates a repair by saying "wha-." "What" is considered one of the open-class repair initiators, such as "huh" or "sorry?" (Drew, 1997). They do not specify what the trouble-source is or the nature of the problem. In other words, they have the weakest power to specify the trouble-source. In response to Sangmin's question word "wha-" reaction, Yumi repeats her prior turn "February," which shows Yumi's understanding of Sangmin's repair initiator. She considers the trouble to be a hearing problem when it is in fact an understanding problem to Sangmin. Yumi's quick self-repair production is not what Sangmin is looking for. Yumi's repair fails, leading Sangmin to use another repair initiation: a full sentence with a wh-interrogative. It has much more power to clarify the source of the trouble, and Yumi realizes it was her pronunciation that Sangmin has difficulty understanding. She uses the Korean word "*Ieewal*" after a short pause. Her code-switching leads to Sangmin's solution in line 11 following "ah," the change-of-state token. Yumi laughs, at which point Sangmin does not align.

An example of other-initiation of repair using repetition is presented in excerpt (26). Kyomin is telling an anecdote about two groups of people who had a fight in his church.

Excerpt (26) [Seminar room1] (repetition)

- 01 Kyomin: The other group had a lot of money. So they- I don't know
 02 *maesu?*
 03 Minjun: Bribe.
 04 Kyomin: Bribe. They bribed one judge.

05 Minjun: One judge?
 06 Kyomin: Judge. Yeah, I:: For winning that, (.) that trike.
 07 (0.2)
 08→ Minjun: **°Trike°**
 09 Kyomin: Tr[y.
 10 Minjun: [Trial.
 11 Kyomin: Trial. T(h)rial. Yeah. hhhh
 12 Minjun: And that argument was a little bit serious. More serious
 than I think, I thought.

In line 8, Kyomin's incorrect use of word at line 6 prompts Minjun's repair initiation, which is a repetition of the prior turn. Repetition of the trouble-source can simply clarify what is the problem. It is also a frequently used technique in the language classroom to address learner errors (Wong & Waring, 2010). Teachers use a repetition or partial repetition of the students' previous utterances and elicit students' self-correction (Koshik, 2002). Minjun's repetition in line 8 is spoken at a soft volume and with a rising intonation. A short pause in line 7 shows that other-repair does not come early, thereby proving its dispreferred status. However, as soon as Kyomin engages in self-repair, Minjun catches what the "trike" really is. There is a slight overlap in lines 9 and 10. Kyomin's repetition of the correct word combines with laughter showing his embarrassment. Minjun does not respond to the laughter, but continues on the topic. Therefore, Minjun's repetition in line 8 is different from that of teachers in a classroom as he does not intend to or design his turn to elicit Kyomin's self-repair. Rather, what he does is an act of participation as a co-structor of the talk in progress.

As pointed out in Schegloff et al. (1977), the techniques for other-initiation are techniques for locating the trouble-source. When the recipient initiates repair, he or she usually locates the trouble-source and gives the other speaker a chance to repair for him-

or herself. Yet interestingly, this kind of other-initiation caused by the first speaker's trouble often fails to induce the trouble-source speaker's self-repair and requires multiple turns, ending up with other-repair. In some of the cases, as in excerpts (25) and (26), the speaker of the trouble-source does not have the ability to correct his or her error, even though it is identified as an error by the recipient.

4.1.2.3. Completion of Other-Initiation of Repair

As demonstrated in the excerpts thus far, incorrect pronunciation and choice of words are the most frequent errors that cause other-initiation to occur. They interfere with the interlocutors' understanding of the talk. The other-initiation of repair on sentence structure or grammar does not occur. If the role of other-initiation is to focus on locating the trouble-source, it can be inferred that other-initiation of repairs is overwhelmingly designed to result in self-repair. Therefore, the completion of other-initiated repair is usually succeeded by the trouble-source speaker, unless he or she is not capable of doing repair. It is the same as shown in the native speaker data, and it is evident that non-native speakers also have a preference for self-repair.

However, one type of other-initiation of repair is not aimed to solicit self-repair. Some repair initiations by others that occur in the data include repair completion in the same turn. According to Schegloff et al. (1977), this kind of other-correction is highly constrained in its occurrences and frequently modulated in forms. However, they also pointed out that adult-child interactions or learning environments can be exceptional to this phenomenon, thereby leading to the second question: When do Korean speakers choose to correct the other's prior turn? How do they realize it? Would it be more

frequent and not as highly constrained as Schegloff et al. (1977) mentioned? These questions are discussed in Section 4.2.

4.2 Characteristics of Other-Initiated Other-Repair³ in NNS Talk

As noted in Section 4.1, participants in non-native speaker talk have a tendency to prefer self-initiated self-repair. The other-initiation of repair mostly occurs when there is a possibility of misunderstanding. Other-initiated repair locates and identifies the trouble, and the other gets a response from the speaker of the trouble-source. Thus far, this tendency is similar to that of native speakers. This section explores a different kind of other-initiation of repair. It is designed to combine the initiation and completion of repair in the same turn. It can be called “correction” to prevent confusion. In his work on NS–NNS conversation analyses, Hosoda (2000) questioned whether NNSs’ lack of proficiency in the language might affect the way NSs do other-repair. NSs are expected to help their interlocutors with occasional corrections, as do teachers in educational settings. The result shows that this does not occur in the data. Likewise, in these NNS–NNS data, other-repair initiation is frequent but it does not usually include repair completion. For NNS, it is also face-threatening to correct others’ mistakes when there is no sign of repair invitation. This rare occurrence of other-initiated other-repair is the main focus of this section. There are two ways that this other-repair is realized. First, other-initiated other-repair can be embedded. Second, other-initiated other-repair can be overt. We examine how it is realized to determine whether there is a special type of

³ Other-initiated other-repair in this section is different from that of 4.1.2. The prior section focuses on other-‘initiation’, which can result in both the completion by self or other. But here, OIOR means other-‘repair’ that is done in a single component. It is designed to combine completion of repair at the first place.

trouble-source that tends to provoke those other-initiated other-repairs.

4.2.1 Embedded Other-Initiated Other-Repair

The typical occurrence of initiation of other-repair, as seen in the subsequent section, involves troubles concerning the understanding of the prior turn. When the trouble-source is not an obstacle to understanding, but a knowledge or proficiency gap exists between the participants, the recipient usually lets it pass. However, sometimes they correct the error immediately without locating it or giving the prior turn speaker a chance to repair it. When this happens, it can take two forms: The first is exposed correction, and the other is embedded correction (Jefferson, 1987). Excerpt (27) involves a common example of embedded correction regarding the problem of word choice. It is one of the common forms of repair in the language classroom (Nakamura, 2008) and is also a classic example of modified interaction reported in SLA research (e.g., Long, 1983). It resembles recasts or reformulation discussed in the SLA literature, which are found to be inherently ambiguous as correction techniques (Wong & Waring, 2010). The participants choose to repair in an embedded way because it moves the talk ahead and the topic forward. It can also prevent argumentation and avoid embarrassment compared to the overt methods discussed in the next section. The participants repeat the prior turn with a little variation or the use of an alternative form while they do the next relevant turn. In an embedded correction, addressing lapses in competence or conduct has no place to happen. This way, the talk in progress can continue. Consider the following excerpt:

Excerpt (27) [Café]

01 Dongsu: So, so what- ah what do you want for the dinner together?
02 Heejae: With you?
03 Dongsu: Yes.
04 Heejae: Mm:,How about just eat, surround here?
05→ Dongsu: **Ah around here? [Around here, probably [there are bunch- ah**
06 Heejae: [around, [surround? hehe Around
07 here. hh[hhhh
08 Dongsu: [very a lot here. Probably. And we can-
09 Heejae: Ah you- there is a good restaurant you know in-
10 Dongsu: Ah here?

Excerpt (27) presents Dongsu's single-component other-initiated other-repair in an embedded way. Heejae confuses the word "around" with "surround," and Dongsu does not initiate repair, giving Heejae a chance to correct her error. Dongsu knows what Heejae is trying to ask, and evidently there is no need to lengthen the talk. Dongsu understands how the sequences in interaction go and chooses to repair it himself. He alters the word "surround" into the correct expression "around" and, in doing so, takes a form of clarification. It is unresolved at this point, whether Dongsu's other-initiation of repair targets the correction in word use or focuses on the specification of the place to eat. Heejae obviously understands the former, as she repeats Dongsu's token in line 6, which causes an overlap. However, Dongsu does not intend to induce Heejae's self-repair. After repeating Heejae's turn with an alternative word, he simultaneously does his next relevant turn, which is an answer for Heejae's request. Although it is designed not to shed light on the correction, Heejae shows embarrassment by laughing and talking to herself. It demonstrates that other-repair can make the trouble-source speaker feel somewhat uncomfortable even if done in an embedded way.

Excerpt (28) includes a similar, but different embedded other-repair by repeating the prior turn and adding a substitution. Insu and Jaein have different opinions about what to do in youth. Insu asserts that people should enjoy their life while they are young and energetic.

Excerpt (28) [At home]

01 Insu: I think it's the goal of most people. Not doing an[y-
02 Jaein: [Not doing
03 anything? Reall[y?
04 Insu: [Yeah.
05 Jaein: But-
06 Insu: Everyone's dream. Haha[ha
07 Jaein: [But if you are sixty or seventy,
08 Insu: Ah ha.
09 Jaein: Not doing anything is really good::,
10 Insu: Okay.
11 Jaein: That's the time you have to stop workin[g and studying.
12 Insu: [No, I don't think so.
13 because, you know what? If we get, uh, sixty or seventy or
14 eighty,
15 Jaein: uh huh,
16 Insu: Then we don't have enough Energ[y,
17 Jaein: [Oh::
18 Insu: To do (0.4) anyth[ing],[right?
19 Jaein: [Eh], [eh, so you think you have to,
20 Insu: Play.
21→ Jaein: **Yeah play, enjoy,**
22 Insu: Yeah, enjoy everything [in, in youth.
23 Jaein: [When you have energy. Hahaha That's an
24 idea that I have never thought of.

In line 20 Insu uses “play” to describe the lifestyle, which is one of the incorrect uses that Korean learners frequently choose. The verb “play” in Korean has a meaning of

“hang out,” which is a broader meaning than in English. Jaein produces a repetition of the word, but immediately adds “enjoy,” which is more suitable in this context. Unlike excerpt (27), by repeating the trouble-source turn without changing it, she almost makes Insu’s error *en passant*; hence, she is able to prevent face-threatening situations for Insu. As can be seen in line 22, Insu accepts the repair and continues the topic using the substituted word “enjoy.” The difference between the two kinds of excerpt might lie in the types of error they are dealing with. Using the verb “surround” instead of the preposition “around” is not just a word choice issue, but also a grammatical problem. A grammatical issue is usually not focused upon in this kind of informal conversation, and when it is given orientation by the recipient, it mostly involves comprehension problems, not the grammar itself.

4.2.2 Exposed Other-Initiated Other-Repair

When a participant initiates a single-component other-initiated other-repair, he or she can make it evident that a correction is being made. In this case, whatever has been going on prior to the correction is discontinued, and “correcting” becomes the interactional business of the interchanges (Jefferson, 1983). In addition, the act of correcting can be a matter of addressing lapses in competence or conduct. Excerpt (29) provides an example.

Excerpt (29) [Seminar room 2]

01 Eunmi: It’s very easy, to cook. Hu hm (.) ah: only:: you have to
 02 do is hh (.) just cut the ingredients,
 03→Youngmin: **Chop.**

04 Eunmi: Cho[p.
 05 Youngmin: [Yeah?
 06 Eunmi: And (.)w-wrap them(h)°hh [into the spring roll sheet.
 07 Youngmin: [Mm.

Youngmin and Eunmi are talking about how to make a Vietnam roll. While Eunmi explains the recipe, she uses “cut” to express the act of preparing vegetables using a knife. Eunmi’s first turn provides the impression that she has some difficulties in describing the process. Her turn in line 1 includes a pause, sound stretch, and hesitation. However, she slowly extends her turn and line 2 ends with a continuing intonation. Youngmin, without hesitation, intervenes and corrects her choice of word, saying “chop.” The substitution is accepted by Eunmi immediately, and she repeats it and gets Youngmin’s admission “Yeah,” which has rising intonation, giving Eunmi the signal to continue on. At this moment, Youngmin and Eunmi are each playing the role of a teacher and a student. The participants’ identities have been shown to be dynamic in many previous studies. In native and non-native speaker conversations, native speakers are not eager to adopt the role of the linguistic expert. They usually orient to the task and interaction in the conversation (Kurhila, 2004). The question that remains here is whether their goal of language learning affects the orientation of higher-level participants. In the data, Youngmin has lower proficiency than Eunmi, and there is a considerable gap between their overall fluency.⁴ Thus, it can be assumed that Eunmi can play the role of language expert in their relationship. Considering the given excerpt, the identities as learners with higher and lower levels of proficiency do not manifest in the conversation. Instead, the excerpt shows their role is rather reversed: Eunmi is the

⁴ Eunmi scored 842 on TEPS compared to Youngmin’s 736.

learner and Youngmin the teacher.

This happens once again when they later talk about making pizza, approximately 17 minutes after the conversation about the Vietnam roll. As shown in excerpt (30), while explaining the process of making pizza, Eunmi confronts the same situation, where she has to describe preparing chopped vegetables.

Excerpt (30) [Seminar room 2]

- 01 Eunmi: um, other::pro- process of making pizza is very easy.
02 Becos, °hhuhm, (0.2) all you have to do is
03 (.)uhhh °hh °(cup)° them?
04 Youngmin: Mm hm,
05→ Eunmi: **Chop them? [and]**
06 Youngmin: [Mmhm]
07 Eunmi: And spread it onto dough?
08 Youngmin: Mm hm
09 Eunmi: And bake.
10 Youngmin: And put them in (.) o[ven.]
11 Eunmi: [Put t]hem in the [oven].
12 Youngmin: [oven].

In line 2, Eunmi hesitates and produces a short pause. After an exhale, she says “cup” in line 3 so softly that it is hard to clearly hear. She gets Youngmin’s continuer “Mm hm” to go ahead, but she seems to have learned the new word “chop” and does self-repair to “cup” in her next turn. This is evidence that the repair provided Eunmi with a learning opportunity and that the learning actually happens through repair sequences.

Moreover, when she chooses to use the word “bake,” Youngmin corrects it with a more detailed expression: “put them in oven.” Eunmi repeats the expression,

admitting Youngmin's status as an expert in that field. The participants are not orienting to their overall language proficiency, but to the specific lexical knowledge Youngmin has. Thus, Youngmin has an identity as an expert and helper at this moment.

This kind of repair, treating the other participant as "not yet competent," is very rare in occurrences and also results in multiple turns that withhold the topic. When the participants do not agree on their identities in the moment, an argument about the repair can arise, which can lengthen the inserted repair sequence. In excerpt (31), the different development of talk in the interaction demonstrates how the overt forms of other-repair can result in the flow of talk in an extended way. Excerpt (31) shows other-initiated other-repair consisting of correcting and instructing. Misun and Sungil are having a conversation about an Olympic football game. Sungil is a fan of football, and he has specialized knowledge about football terms.

Excerpt (31) [Study room 1]

- 01 Sungil: I think I can(h) ge(h)t up.[hhhhhh without alarm.
02 Misun: [hahahaha
03 Becaz you- you really like so[ccer. □hh
04→ Sungil: [yeah, football.
05 Misun: Ah-
06 Sungil: Mm.
07 (0.2)
08 Misun: ↑Soccer.
09 Sungil: Football is correct expression.
10 Misun: Really?
11 Sungil: Yeah football.
12 (1.0)
13 Sungil: SOCCER, soccer is ↑just in the U.S.

14 Misun: Mm:[:.
 15 Sungil: [every o(h)ther- every [worl]d, you know, football.
 16 Misun: [mm::]
 17 mm::
 18 Sungil: And in the Olympic games it's football.
 19 Misun: Ah:::[:], I didn't know that.
 20 Sungil: [yeah, Yeah. Football.
 21 Misun: □Hah, but (.) if you
 22 Sungil: Mm
 23 Misun: get up at three::
 24 Sungil: Mm
 25 Misun: and watch the soccer game.

As previously mentioned, participants engage in repair while they do the next relevant turn in an embedded repair. In doing overt other-initiated other-repair, however, the ongoing talk is discontinued and the act of correcting becomes an interactional business. In excerpt (31), Sungil corrects Misun's choice of word in line 4, but he does not get acceptance from Misun. She disapproves in line 7 (silence) and 8 (↑ soccer), and there is also a long pause in line 12 (1.0), which shows Misun's disagreement or incomplete understanding. Sungil explains why it is correct to use the word "football" and constantly repeats the expression. Misun's change of state token "Ah:::" in line 19 displays that she finally accepts Sungil's idea. However, there is no sign of learning, as she continues to use the word "soccer" as her last turn in line 25 shows. The excerpt is a typical example that shows that an overt other-repair does not merely pursue the function of putting things right, but also has a purpose of addressing gaps in competence. As in excerpt (30), the participants' proficiency is not an affecting factor in the occurrence of other-initiated other-repair. Sungil has a lower proficiency than Misun, but he does overtly repair Misun's choice of word.

As seen in the three different excerpts, exposed, overt other-repair occurs in a constrained and distinctive context. It happens in situations where the participants' knowledge in a specific field is presented. It does not involve orientation toward participants' language proficiency level, but rather has a relationship with the topic or the object being discussed at the very moment. In other words, it is not the participants' identity as a language learner that is relevant.

4.3 Development of Subsequent Turns after Other-Repair

In this section, subsequent turns after different kinds of other-repair sequences are examined in several aspects. As previous sections have discussed, even in NNS conversations, a preference toward the self-initiation of repair has been observed. However, due to their lack of competence, the self-initiation trial frequently fails and it is completed by the other. This is the focus of Section 4.3.1, which will concentrate on results of self-initiated other-repair. We will examine how the recipient of repair reacts and produces uptake. In Section 4.3.2 the results of other-initiated other-repair, especially a single-component one, will be explored to determine whether it develops in a different aspect from that of self-initiated one. This section, therefore, aims to determine how the rest of the sequences turn out and compares and contrasts the development of two differently initiated other-repairs. In addition, other-repair and its connection with learning opportunity, which was mentioned in the earlier section, will be examined more deeply now, as necessary. Moreover, repair uptake and its relationship with participants' identity and orientation toward language proficiency will be explored.

4.3.1 Subsequent Turns of Self-Initiated Other-Repair

Self-initiated other-repair in the current data has a clear and continuously occurring pattern. When the current speaker has a problem finishing his or her repair, the recipient intervenes and completes the repair. In this case, the trouble-source speaker mostly accepts the repair and repeats the expression given, showing confirmation. In excerpt (32), Sangmin and Yumi are talking about classes they are taking and different characteristics of the exams.

Excerpt (32) [Study room 2]

- 01 Yumi: Yeah, when I- when I study for- mo- when I study
02 accounting and finance?
03 Sangmin: Um.
04 Yumi: After I study accounting and finance, then I[:
05→ Sangmin: [something
06 rema[in
07 Yumi: [I definitely have something, yeah, remain in mind?
08 I- I definitely have get- I definitely achieve some
09 ability to solve problem(h)?
10 Sangmin: hhhh
11 Yumi: I like that kind of feeling.
12 Sangmin: Yeah, that's true. I think that's related to the type of
13 exam.
14 Yumi: Uhm.
15 Sangmin: So, oh no, marketing exam or marketing or other,
16 [ah be- human behavior, human organizational something?
17 Yumi: [yeah, orga- organizational behavior]
18 Yeah.
19 Sangmin: We just write down some: uh[m
20→ Yumi: [so]mething we memorized.
21 Sangmin: Yeah, something we memorized before.
22 Yumi: Yeah, we just solve all(hh), all the thing we memorized.

- 23 Sangmin: Uhm.
24 Yumi: I don't like that kind of.
25 Sangmin: Tch, uhm, that's why I like, accounting and finance.

In line 5, Sangmin completes the turn that Yumi stretched. Yumi's stretch in line 4 is a common pre-indicator of a particular type of repair, such as a word search. By co-completing the repair and helping Yumi continue the turn, Sangmin shows his understanding and aligns with Yumi. Yumi provides uptake, using the given word—albeit with more explanation. With Sangmin's help, Yumi is able to expand her turn. In turn, lines 19 and 20 show a reversed situation: Now Yumi completes the turn that Sangmin is in the process of producing. Sangmin's stretch in line 19 indicates repair initiation. Another non-lexical perturbation “uhm” in the same line is also known as an element that initiates repair on a next-due item (Schegloff, 1979). Sangmin's self-initiation of self-repair shows that he has trouble coming up with suitable words, and Yumi offers an appropriate expression to complete the sentence for him. Sangmin accepts her repair by repeating it. Through the process of word search—other-repair—repetition with expansion, the two participants can continue their turn and make the flow of talk spontaneous. Although Sangmin is a more fluent speaker than Yumi, they are helping each other regardless of their language proficiency.

Another example in excerpt (33) also shows self-initiated other-repair dealing with a word search. Heejae, who is a fan of Samsung, went to a stadium to watch the Lotte and Samsung baseball game. She tells Dongsu that Lotte won the game, and she was upset about the result as a Samsung fan because she watched the whole game from the very beginning.

Excerpt (33) [Café]

- 01 Heejae: Lotte's wi- won [the game].
02 Dongsu: [Ah Lotte] finally won the game.
03 Heejae: Yeah. [So I'm very,]
04 Dongsu: [Okay so,] ah: yeah [it's right].
05 Heejae: [Ah, Becaz]I:: watched that
06 (.)the fo-start-
07 Dongsu: Mm hm.
08 Heejae: Ti- [and]
09 Dongsu: [Mm hm]
10 Heejae: Start to fin- fini- finish
11→ Dongsu: **Ah hah? From beginning to the end.**
12 Heejae: Beginnin[g ye]s.
13 Dongsu: [okay]. And why do you like Samsung?

Heejae has a problem finding a suitable expression in line 5. Her repair initiation continues, leading up to line 10, where she finally reaches a solution that is still incorrect. Although her remark is incomplete, Dongsu catches her intention and produces a continuer sign of go ahead “Mm hm” in lines 7 and 9 and “ah hah” in line 11, showing his understanding. He provides a repair in line 11, after displaying his understanding of Heejae’s prior trial. Heejae, in line 12, gives a partial repetition of the given expression. Heejae’s uptake overlaps with Dongsu’s “okay,” which is a receipt or an acceptance marker (Beach, 1991). Dongsu moves on to continue the previously ongoing talk. Cases like these occur frequently in the data, and the trouble-source speaker orients to the helper who is an expert on the very moment. Brouwer (2003) uses his data of NS–NNS interactions to claim that, in a certain context, a word search can be seen as providing a language learning opportunity. The shared characteristics are that the other participant is invited to participate in the search and that the interactants

demonstrate an orientation to language expertise. It is assumed that even in NNS talk, participants orient to language expertise, thereby increasing the opportunity for learning. These conditions are met in Heejae and Dongsu's case. Although Heejae does not directly invite Dongsu to repair, there is an evident atmosphere that resembles that of a classroom involving a teacher and a student.

One common important value of the two repair sequences here is that, through practice, they co-construct their conversation. The recipient's repair offer enables the ongoing talk to keep going, not letting it fail. The trouble-source speaker produces uptake by repetition, or repetition with expansion. Repetition is the activity known to be central to the processes of both first- and second-language acquisition and learning (Pirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009; Park, 2013). The participants collaboratively participate in the conversation by repeating and expanding the expressions, which creates opportunities for learning, drawing attention to the details of language use.

However, not every self-initiated other-repair gets a repetition from the trouble-source speaker. Sometimes it is just accepted without repetition or even rejected.

Consider excerpt (34):

Excerpt (34) [Café]

- 01 Heejae: Ah becaz I- my mom give me a fruits, I don't like fruits,
02 so::
- 03 Dongsu: Mm ah hah you don't eat.
- 04 Heejae: My:: don't like fruits, [so I don't eat them, I- I'm not
05 eat them.
- 06 Dongsu: [Mm hm
- 07→ **Ah, you are not gonna eat it.**
- 08 Heejae: Yeah. hehehhhhh
- 09 Dongsu: Yes, I don't like it. But I can eat, like eh:: bananas
and peach.

Heejae is telling Dongsu about her dislike of fruits. In Heejae's second turn (line 4), she explains how she reacts to her mother, who forces her to eat fruits. In this turn, she replaces a grammatically correct sentence with an incorrect one. Her initial trial "I don't eat them" has no grammatical problem, but it cannot convey what she really wants to say. She initiates self-repair 'I- I'm not eat them.' which is grammatically incorrect. But in line 7, Dongsu catches her intention and provides a correct expression, which includes the future tense that Heejae has failed to use. Dongsu's repair is agreed to by Heejae, but not with a repetition of it. Instead, Heejae's confirmation is followed by laughs.

Laughing is a frequently occurring action when other-repair is done in the data of this research (see excerpt (25) in Section 4.1.2 and excerpt (27) in Section 4.2.1). In a study on NNS and NS talk, Park (2007) pointed out that an NNS might topicalize his or her linguistic deficiency through self-deprecation. In response, NS takes up a position where he or she can mitigate the negativity conveyed in NNS's assessment. NNS's laugh after the other-repair is frequently observed, as in excerpt (34). Similar to a negative self-assessment, the trouble-source speaker's laugh is another way of showing embarrassment. Laughing is an action that usually invites the other participants to laugh, but Dongsu does not laugh as he understands that Heejae's laugh is originated from her self-deprecatory feeling, and Dongsu's laugh can be an agreement to it.

Occasionally, self-initiated other-repair is rejected. Excerpt (35) is Eunmi and Youngmin's conversation about Bach.

Excerpt (35) [Seminar room 2]

- 01 Eunmi: Oh may(h)be, Maybe other reason, that uhm: people think
02 that □hh Bach is very important in music, h- history of
03 music is □hh ah, he:: organized,
04 Youngmin: Mm hm.
05 Eunmi: Di- the major and minor (h[old) of] music.
06 Youngmin: [Really,] mm
07 Eunmi: So,
08 Youngmin: It's interesting.
09 Eunmi: Yes. Di, He, uhm organized and, how can I say.
10 (0.7)
11 Eunmi: He: uhm,
12 → Youngmin: **Initiate?**
13 Eunmi: Not initiate? But, how can I say, ah, hm, (0.5) he
14 gather- ah, not gather.
15 Youngmin: M[m:
16 Eunmi: [Ahk, [anyway]. Anyway. Ah, He:: almost (1.0) build,
17 Youngmin: [()]
18 Mm hm,
19 Eunmi: The basic of tonality?

Eunmi's self-initiation of repair, which is a word search, is shown from lines 9 to 11. A typical word search marker "how can I say" occurs at the end of line 9. This kind of self-question is frequently found in NNS talk, while NSs ask a question of the recipient, such as "what do you call it" (Park, 2007). Youngmin tries to complete Eunmi's turn by providing the word, but Eunmi rejects it and continues on her repair. Sangmin has lower language proficiency than Eunmi. Not every self-initiated other-repair of lower-level participants is rejected. As seen in excerpt (32) in this section, their identities can vary according to the topic or the context. However, it is notable that lower-level participants' self-initiated other-repair is often rejected by their counterparts, but not vice versa.

Another interesting problem remaining here is that sometimes incorrect other-repair is provided and the trouble-source speaker accepts it. Then, false linguistic knowledge can be learned through NNS–NNS repair.

Excerpt (36) [Seminar room 1]

- 01 Taekhyun: I- uhm I have a very specific- so distincti-
02 distictable- distinctive-
03 →Dojin: **Distinuishful,**
04 Taekhyun: Ah, distinguishful character.
05 Dojin: Yeah, yeah, she like that.

Park (2007) argues that word searches are mostly solved through interaction, as demonstrated by the fact that participants repeat the given word. In the context of excerpt (36), Dojin gives an incorrect repair at the end of Taekhyun’s word search trial. Taekhyun, however, shows a change of state through the token “ah” and repeats the word. This kind of example could indicate that there is a limitation of NNS conversation in terms of learning. Nevertheless, it is still meaningful in the sense that they are actively using their lexical knowledge to solve the problem in talk-in-interaction.

As such, do different results of repair explain their relationship with language proficiency? There is no case where a lower-level participant rejects a higher-level participant’s repair in the data. It is more likely that participants’ language proficiency affects the uptake of self-initiated other-repair. When NNS participants orient for language expertise in their talk, they display identities related to their positions. The higher-level participant plays an expert role more often than the lower-level participant. These invoked identities are not constant throughout the talk, though. As discussed in

the previous section, their language proficiency only provides them with temporal and relative identity as an expert or novice. Moreover, such identities need to be agreed upon by the two participants, if it were to be relevant in the flow of interaction. It is especially true in sequences of other-initiated other-repair, which will be discussed in the next section.

4.3.2 Subsequent Turns of Other-Initiated Other-Repair

Other-initiated other-repair inevitably takes up multiple turns; at least two turns diverged from the ongoing talk. The most common case of other-initiated other-repair is caused by understanding or hearing issues. In this case, sequences after repair display similar patterns with self-initiated other-repair. Excerpt (37) provides an example.

Excerpt (37) [Study room 2]

- 01 Sangmin: But, I don't know, I just want to go to some, ah,
 02 southern Europe,
 03 which is very, ah, famous about- I mean (0.2) Paris or::
 04 (0.2)
 05→ Yumi: Southern Europe?
 06 Sangmin: Southern Europe.
 07 Yumi: Southern Europe is Spain, Greece? O[r,
 08 Sangmin: [Oh, so where is the
 09 PAry then?
 10 (1.0)
 11→ Yumi: **Paris is lik- uhm, ↑YEah, ah, yeah, it's- ah- western**
 12 **Europe?**
 13 Sangmin: Ah yeah. I just[(h) (),hahaha
 14 hahaha □hh
 15 Yumi: [Eh hahahahahahahahaha
 16 Sangmin: I- I, I thought that the 'Suh' (h) as[(hh) southern.

conditions should be met to make a single-component other-repair to be accepted.

In the data, participants sometimes repair the other's talk in an overt way, adopting the identity of an expert or even that of a teacher. In excerpt (38), Heejae and Dongsu have just talked about the Olympic Games and now Heejae is bringing up a new topic: a baseball game she watched. Dongsu does not notice that Heejae is mentioning a different subject and directly corrects her prior turn with a whole new idea. Dongsu, the higher-level participant, conjectures that Heejae does not know the name of the Olympic Games "archery," although he clearly hears what she says. He assumes that Heejae watched the archery game on TV as they talked about the games on TV. Dongsu's line 8 "Oh, you actually went to the stadium?" shows another cause of his misunderstanding. It is hard to think that Dongsu did not hear "baseball game" in Heejae's first line, which was clearly enunciated by Heejae, who speaks very slowly.

Excerpt (38) [Café]

- 01 Heejae: Ah I- I- I saw ah, baseball game yesterday?
02 Dongsu: Archery, right?
03 Heejae: °hh
04→ Dongsu: **Archery.**
05 Heejae: Baseball game.
06 Dongsu: Ah, baseball game.
07 Heejae: Yeah.
08 Dongsu: Oh, you actually went to the stadium?
09 Heejae: I sayid a BASEBALLga[me].
10 Dongsu: [Eh huhhuh.
11 Heejae: NO, as you know I don't like go to the stadium.

His being an expert invokes a strong opposition from Heejae. In line 9, Heejae very loudly emphasizes that what she said was a "baseball game." She shows her

uncomfortable emotion upon Dongsu's somewhat condescending position as a more proficient language learner. Another similar example is presented in excerpt (39).

Excerpt (39) [Seminar room 1]

- 01 Dojin: Tomorrow you wanna meet her again?
02 Taekhyun: Yeah, yeah, in *Gang-nam*.
03 Dojin: Yeah.
04 Taekhyun: The most famous city nowadays.
05 Dojin: Dish- did she say she gonna meet you tomorrow?
06 Taekhyun: Sure, She live in *Yieksam*? I beilive so. And, and-
07 Dojin: In where, *Gangnam*, again?
08 Taekhyun: Yeah, yeah, becoz it is most populous city in the world
09 now.
10→Dojin: **In Seoul.**
11 Taekhyun: Ah, no, no, n[o].
12→Dojin: **[*Gangnam* is not a name of the city.**
13 Taekhyun: Ah, yeah, yeah.
14 Dojin: Just one of the district.
15 Taekhyun: Ah- district, district.
16 Dojin: Alright?
17 Taekhyun: †SORRY about THAT:: You don't have to check it, all about
18 the (scene). That I- that I had- [mis-mistaken.
19 Dojin: [hahahahahahah[ha.
20 Taekhyun: [Ow, ow,
21 ow.
22 Dojin: I think our Enlgish is (0.3) broken.
23 Taekyun: Ah, no, I think that my English is very good.

Dojin and Taekhyun are having a conversation about the place where Taekhyun is going to meet his date. Taekhyun describes “*Gangnam*” as the most popular city in the “world.” Dojin, in line 10, repairs the “world” into “Seoul” because “*Gangnam*” is one of the districts in the city of Seoul. At first, Taekhyun misunderstands Dojin's repair and rejects it. He thinks what Dojin is trying to downgrade the status of “*Gangnam*” as a

popular city in Seoul, not the world. But Dojin's next turn clarifies his prior repair, and now Taekhyun accepts it. In line 15, Taekhyun repeats Dojin's repair of "district" twice. Thus far, it is similar to the result of the self-initiated other-repair. Through other-repair, the learning of a new word is taking place. However, after that, Dojin confirms Taekhyun's understanding of the repair by saying "Alright?" which invokes Taekhyun's strong backlash. He apologizes to him with a loud and high-pitched tone, which makes his apology sound more like a show of annoyance. He also comments about Dojin's repair that his action was unnecessary in line 17. Through these remarks, Taekhyun challenges Dojin's teacher identity. In response to his backlash, Dojin laughs without saying anything. But in line 22, Dojin backs down from his position and provides assessment on their language ability. This time, he does not take the identity of a teacher or expert. He tries to make a learner or novice identity relevant for both of them by saying that "our English is broken." Taekhyun, on the other hand, rejects the idea and shows disagreement. Taekhyun and Dojin both have an advanced level of English proficiency. Would Dojin's teacher identity be accepted by Taekhyun more easily if there were a gap in their language expertise? Considering the result of excerpt (38), it would not be the case. Still, the case of a lower-level learner showing an expert identity is very rare in the data. It is then evident that lower-level learners tend not to overtly repair higher-level learners' remarks.

This excerpt shows that acting as a teacher needs to be done cautiously. Even in NS–NNS conversations, correction is rare and constrained. The participants' identities in language proficiency are not as evident as those of NNS and NS. Their identities are renegotiable throughout the talk, and they are not something stable or fixed. There can

create a conflict if the ideas about identities are not agreed upon.

Thus far, we have examined two different types of sequences after repair: self-initiated other-repair and other-initiated other-repair. Throughout the examination, it can be said that the repair uptake does not depend on who initiated the repair. Both of the repairs result in different types of post sequences. They are accepted, repeated, and sometimes rejected. However, it is clear that an overt single-component other-repair frequently interferes with the flow of the later talk and is not easily accepted by the trouble-source speaker.

In terms of identity and language proficiency, similar results are shown in self-initiated other-repair and other-initiated other-repair. In self-initiated other-repair, it can be said that speakers' identities as an expert or novice become relevant when the recipient completes the repair and the trouble-source speaker accepts it. The higher-level participant's approach like a teacher and the lower-level participant's approach like a student are more frequently relevant in self-initiated other-repair, but the participants' language proficiency is not always related with their identities. Sometimes the roles are reversed. In other-initiated other-repair, especially in the case of overt single-component other-initiated other-repair, the relationship of identities and proficiency is similar, but more complex. In this kind of other-repairs, one participant's expert identity is not easily relevant by the counterpart, regardless of their language proficiency.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes the present study. Section 5.1 summarizes the findings of the study and discusses its pedagogical implications. Section 5.2 provides limitations of this study and suggestions for further research.

5.1 Summary of the Findings and Pedagogical Implications

The present study has explored the characteristics of other-repair in L2 conversation between Korean learners outside the classroom, with a special focus on conditions under which it occurs and patterns it involves. The study was motivated by the need to examine NNS conversations and the sequences of other-repair. The main interest here was the question about what is special or different about the way Korean NNSs manage the troubles in their talk-in-interaction. The study mostly focused on the repair completed by the other, but in order to reveal its basis it included investigation on self-repair as well.

First, this study examined the preference toward self-repair found in NS–NS and NS–NNS conversation. In order to identify the preference of NNS participants, self- and other-repair initiation and its completion were analyzed. Due to the participants' goal of learning and practicing English, it was assumed that there might be a possibility of more frequent other-repair sequences or no preference toward self-repair. However, the research found that NNS–NNS conversation also displayed the same preference

structure and characteristics in terms of its placement, trouble-source, device, and completion. Four different types of self-initiated repair were identified, as in other types of conversation. They dealt with the same types of trouble-source, including word search and grammar correction. Devices used for repair initiation were cut-off, pause, repetition, rising intonation, question, and lastly code-switching, which is unique in NNS–NNS conversation. Yet in terms of its completion, the result was somewhat different in several ways. In native speaker data, self-repair initiation usually contains repair completion by the self. In these data, the first type of self-initiated repair was the one completed by the self as in NS data. However, the second type of self-initiated repair was not completed by the self, but by the other. Due to their lack of language proficiency and especially their weakness in vocabulary, their self-initiation was frequently lengthened. They only located the place they were having a problem and did not successfully complete the repair by him- or herself. The common pattern was that the repair devices signaled their repair initiation, and the other speakers intervened and completed the turn instead. The deciding factor in the completion of self-repair initiation was mostly the current speaker's ability to continue the turn. When they were not handling the turn appropriately or asking for help—whether implicit or explicit—the other speaker engaged in the ongoing talk. A great example of this phenomenon was shown in code-switching. Code-switching with a rising tone or non-lexical perturbation was considered to be repair initiation by the participants. However, if code-switching was done without showing any difficulties, it was not completed by the co-participant. In other words, if the current speaker code-switched without showing problems, it was treated as a compensation strategy, and the conversation continued. The third pattern of

the completion of self-initiation was found when the repair was designed to prompt other-completion. This kind of self-initiation involved directly asking for help. The recipient's repair was delayed as long as possible, to the point where the trouble-source speaker directly asked for help. Therefore, it can be said that the self-initiation of repair by NNS quite often induced repair completion by other NNS, and this other-repair occurred only when the speaker of the trouble-source was experiencing difficulty in managing his or her talk and the other noticed it. However, these other-completions did not come early. The participants waited for the self-repair, giving the trouble-source speaker a chance. Such evidence supports the conclusion that they prefer self-repair, although they also showed interactional competence. They did not let their talk lengthen, but provided appropriate help despite their imperfect language proficiency. They were using repair as a tool for meaning negotiation and an effective facilitator of communication.

Second, other-initiated repair was also examined in order to support the evidence of preference for self-repair. Other-initiated repair in NNS talk also occupied a main position: the next turn relative to the trouble-source turn, as in NS-NS talk. The participants withheld repair initiation while the trouble-source turn was in progress. Trouble-source usually involved an understanding of the problems of conversation. Although the conversation in these data had a goal of enhancing the target language proficiency, grammatical errors were not treated as reparable. It indicated the characteristic of this kind of NNS talk. Their main goal was to have a conversation naturally; hence, their talk was meaning oriented. They used several devices to initiate other-repair, such as repetition, rising intonation, and question. The completion of other-

initiated repair was usually succeeded by the trouble-source speaker, unless he or she was not capable of making the repair. It was the same as proven in NS–NS data and evidence that non-native speakers also have a preference for self-repair.

The third finding focused on a specific type of other-initiated other-repair, which includes both repair initiation and its completion in a single component. As mentioned in Schegloff et al. (1977), this kind of other-correction could occur frequently in a conversation involving a “not-yet-competent” speaker. There were two types of a single-component other-initiated other-repair in the data. The participant engaged in other-repair in an embedded or exposed way. In embedded other-repair, they designed their correction not to highlight the error of their counterpart. They used repetition and immediately continued in their talk in order to prevent face-threatening situations. In exposed other-repair, they overtly provided repair and showed the identity of an expert. They addressed gaps in language competence, and throughout the repair sequences, opportunity for learning and actual learning were confirmed. Exposed or overt other-repair did not occur frequently, and it happened in a constrained and distinctive context. It happened in situations where participants’ knowledge of a specific field was presented. It did not involve orientation toward the language proficiency level of the participants, but rather had a relationship with the topic or the object being discussed at that moment.

Finally, this study investigated the development of subsequent turns after two different types of other-repair. Throughout the examination, the repair uptake did not depend on who initiated the repair. Both of the repairs resulted in various types of post sequences. They were accepted, repeated, and sometimes rejected. In self-initiated other-repair, the identities as an expert or a novice became relevant when the recipient

completed the repair and the trouble-source speaker accepted it. The higher-level participants' acting a teacher and the lower-level participants' acting as a student became relevant more frequently in self-initiated other-repair, but the participants' language proficiency was not always related with their identities. In other-initiated other-repair, especially in the case of overt single-component other-initiated other-repair, the participants' expert identity was not easily accepted by the recipient, regardless of their language proficiency.

The findings of this study have pedagogical implications. First, the current study certifies the value of NNS–NNS talk by showing how such experiences are normal and natural as NS–NS or NS–NNS talk. Therefore, learners voluntarily gathering to practice the target language outside the classroom can be encouraged to provide them with many more opportunities for producing output, which will ultimately enhance their language proficiency. Second, the result of current study can be utilized to give language teachers some ideas about how to teach repair. We have seen how the learners repair other participants' turns throughout the research. Based on the results, foreign language teachers can help learners increase their awareness of repair and enhance their ability to combine repair effectively in conversations.

5.2. Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

The current study has some limitations. First, the data used in the study are based on audio recordings without any visual aids. Gestures or eye gazes have been used as a tool to analyze repair sequences in several CA studies (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hosoda, 2006; Park, 2007) to reveal additional information about what actually happens

during repair. Some of the analyses might have been differently examined if visual information was available.

Second, the conversations of the current data are confined as a certain type; they consist of adult learner dyads, and the average English proficiency of the participants is more than high intermediate, with only one beginning-level learner. The pattern of repair might be different in a conversation of more than three people. Conversations between beginners might show different types of repair devices or placement.

Thus, it would be interesting and worth examining the different types of conversation, such as talks involving more than three people or adolescents whose proficiency level is much lower, to broaden the spectrum of the research.

REFERENCES

- Ana Alegria, de la Colina & Maria del Pilar Garcia, M. (2009). Oral interaction in task-based EFL learning: The use of the L2 as a cognitive tool. *Interactional Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47, 325-345.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social interaction: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 325-352.
- Brouwer, C. E. & Rasmussen, G. & Wagner, J. (2004). Embedded Corrections in Second Language Talk. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 75-94). London: Continuum.
- Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning?, *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 4, 534-545.
- Carroll, D. (2004). Restarts in novice turn beginnings: Disfluencies or interactional achievements? In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 201-220). London: Continuum.
- Drew, P. (1997). "Open" class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 69-101.
- Egbert, M. & Niebecker, L. & Rezzara, S. (2004). Inside first and second language speakers' trouble in understanding, In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 178-200). London: Continuum.
- First, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental

- concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237-259.
- Fujii, A. & Mackey, A. (2009). Interactional feedback in learner-learner interactions in a task-based EFL classroom. *Interactional Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47, 267-301.
- Gardner, R., & Wagner, J. (Eds.) (2004). *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum.
- Gaskill, W. (1980). Correction in native speaker-nonnative speaker conversation. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 125-137). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Goodwin, M.H & Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture and Coparticipation in the Activity of Searching for a Word. *Semiotica* 62(1/2): 51-75.
- Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 511-526.
- Heritage, J. C. (1984b). A Change of-State Token and Aspects of Its Sequential Placement. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds). *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 299-345.
- Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-Repair in Japanese Conversation Between Nonnative and Native Speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 39-63.
- Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and and relevance of differential language expertise. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 1, 25-50.
- Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G.

- Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp.86-100). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientation in conversation-for-learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 551-567.
- Kasper, G., & Kim, Y. (2007). Handling sequentially inapposite responses. In Z. Hua, P. Seedhouse, L. Wei, & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social inter-action* (pp. 22-41). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35(3), 277-309.
- Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(7), 1083-1110.
- Kurhila, S. (2004). Clients or language learners-Being a second language speaker in institutional interaction, In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 58-74). London: Continuum.
- Lee, M. J. (2008). Preference Organization in the Use of Learners' L1 in Pair Interaction of a Korean EFL Classroom. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol.24, No, 1, 61-83.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4. 126-141.
- Mazeland, H. & Zaman-Zadeh, M. The logic of clarification: Some observations about word-clarificatio reparis in Finnish-as-a-Lingua-Franca interactions. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 201-220).

London: Continuum.

- McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society*, 19, 349-377.
- Mondada, L. (2004). Ways of 'doing being plurilingual' in international work meetings. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (eds.), *Second language talk*, 27-60. London: Continuum.
- Mori, J. (2007). Border crossings? Exploring the intersection of second language acquisition, conversation analysis, and foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 849-862.
- Nakamura, I. (2008). Understanding how teacher and student talk with each other: An exploration of how 'repair' displays the co-management of talk-in-interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 2, pp. 265-283.
- Norrick, N. (1991). On the organization of corrective exchanges in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 16, 59-83.
- Park, I. H. (2007). Co-construction of word search activities in native and non-native speaker interaction. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 7, 1-23.
- Park, J.-E. (2007). Co-construction of nonnative speaker identity in cross-cultural interaction, *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 339-360.
- Park, Y.-J. (2013). The Roles of Third-Turn Repeats in Two L2 Classroom Interactional Contexts, *Applied Linguistics*, 2013:1-24
- Park, Y.-Y. (2003). Characteristics of NNS Talk in Oral Interview, *English Teaching*, 58(3), 41-68.
- Piirainen-Marsh, A. & Tainio, L. (2009). Other-Repetition as a Resource for

- Participation in the Activity of Playing a Video Game. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93, 152-166.
- Pike, K. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987b). Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction. *Linguistics*, 25(1), 201-218.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992b). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1295-1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When “others” initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(2), 205-243.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*, vol 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.
- Schwartz, J. (1980). The negotiation of meaning: Repair in conversations between SL learners of English. *Discourse analysis in second language research*. 138-153.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38, 165-197.

- Seedhouse, P. (2005a). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38, 165-187.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd edition). London: Sage.
- Varonis, E. M. & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/Non-native conversations: A Model for negotiation of Meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol 6, No. 1, 71-90.
- Waring, H. Z. (2005c) The unofficial businesses of repair initiation: Vehicles for affiliation and disaffiliation. In A. Tyler, M. Takada, Y. Kim, & D. Marinova (Eds.), *Language in use: Cognitive and discourse perspectives on language and language learning* (pp. 163-175). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Wong, J. & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Wong, J. (2000a). Repetition in conversation: A look at “first and second sayings.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(4), 407-424.
- Wong, J. (2000b). The token “yeah” in nonnative speaker English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(1), 39-67.
- Wong, J. (2000c). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(1) 244-267.
- Wong, J. (2004). Some preliminary thoughts on delay as an interactional resource. In R. Garder & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 114-131). London: Continuum.
- Wong, J., & Olsher, D. (2000). Reflections on conversation analysis and nonnative

speaker talk: An interview with Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11, 111-128.

APPENDIX: Transcription Conventions

- [] Overlap between utterances. A single left bracket indicates the point of overlap onset. A single right bracket indicates the point at which an utterance or utterance-part.
- = Equal signs, one at the end of one line and one at the beginning of a next, indicate no 'gap' between the two lines.
- (0.0) Numbers in parentheses indicate elapsed time in silence by tenth of seconds, so (2.0) is a pause of 2 seconds.
- (.) A dot in parentheses indicates a tiny 'gap' within or between utterances.
- :: Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. Multiple colons indicate a more prolonged sound.
- A dash indicates a cut-off.
- Word Underscoring indicates some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude
- . A period indicates a stopping fall in tone.
- , A comma indicates a continuing intonation.
- ? A question mark indicates a rising intonation.
- The absence of an utterance-final marker indicates some sort of 'indeterminate' contour.
- ↑ ↓ Arrows indicate marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance part immediately following the arrow.
- WORD Upper case indicates especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk.
- Utterances or utterance-parts bracketed by degree signs are relatively

quieter than the surrounding talk.

< > Right or left carets bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicate speeding up.

□h A dot-prefixed row of hs indicates an inbreath. Without the dot, the hs indicates an outbreath or laughter.

w(h)ord A parenthesized h, or a row of hs within a word, indicates breathiness, as in laughter.

() Empty parentheses indicate the transcriber's inability to hear what was said.

국문초록

본 연구는 교실 밖에서 이루어지는 한국인 영어 학습자들의 영어 대화에서 나타나는 타인수정(other-repair)을 발생 조건과 패턴을 중심으로 살펴보았다. 이 연구의 주된 관심은 비원어민간의 대화와 수정 연속체(repair sequence)를 살펴봄으로써 한국인 비원어민들이 상호작용을 하는 대화 속에서 문제 상황을 어떻게 관리하는지를 알아보는 것이다. 본 연구는 타인에 의한 수정에 특별히 초점을 두면서, 또한 자기 수정(self-repair)과도 비교하여 살펴보았다.

본 연구는 한국인 영어 학습자 여덟 쌍의 대화를 음성 녹음한 약 300분에 이르는 데이터를 분석하였다. 데이터는 전통적인 대화분석 기법에 따라 분석되었다. 본 연구의 결과는 수정관행에서 실제로 무엇이 일어나는지를 다음과 같이 매우 세밀하게 보여준다.

첫째, 비원어민의 대화에서 원어민간의 혹은 원어민과 비원어민간의 대화에서 나타나는 자기수정에 대한 선호도(preference)가 나타난다. 이를 알아보기 위해 자기수정과 타인수정은 각각 그것의 시작과 완성의 측면에서 분석되었다. 그 결과, 수정의 시작 부분은 원어민의 대화와 비슷한 패턴을 보였으나 완성은 비원어민들의 언어 능숙도의 부족함으로 인해 타인수정으로 빈번하게 마무리되는 것으로 밝혀졌다. 다만 타인수정은 상대발화자가 명시적(exposed) 혹은 암시적(embedded)으로 도움을 요청하거나 대화 진행에 명백한 어려움을 겪는 경우에 한해 이루어지는 경우가 많았으며 그 발생이 최대한

미루어지는 특징을 보였다.

둘째, 타인 수정의 특징을 특별히 수정의 시작과 완성이 함께 이루어지는 종류에 초점을 맞추어 알아보았다. 이러한 타인수정은 명시적이거나 암시적인 두 가지 방법으로 이루어졌다. 암시적인 타인수정에서는 발화자들이 상대의 오류를 가능한 눈에 띄지 않도록 수정하는 반면, 명시적인 타인수정에서는 특정 분야에 대한 전문가적인 정체성을 취하며 수정을 하는 예들을 발견하였다. 이 과정에서 학습의 가능성이 나타나며, 실제로 학습이 일어나는 것도 확인되었다. 명시적, 혹은 암시적인 타인 수정은 전체 데이터에서 드물게 발생하였으며 제한적인 상황에서만 나타났다.

마지막으로, 타인수정이 이루어진 이후 대화의 발전양상에 대하여 알아보았다. 수정이 누구에 의해서 시작되느냐가 타인수정의 결과에 영향을 미쳤는지를 살펴보았으나 뚜렷한 관련은 없는 것으로 나타났다. 두 종류의 타인수정 모두 수락, 반복, 또는 거절이라는 다양한 결과를 보여주었다. 또한 타인수정의 결과와 언어능숙도에 대한 의식의 관계에 있어서도 두 종류 모두 크게 관계가 없다는 것을 보여주었다. 자기 자신에 의한 수정 시작의 경우 전문가의 정체성을 지닌 발화자의 타인 수정이 받아들여지는 예가 많았으나 모든 예가 이처럼 언어 능숙도와 관계가 있는 것은 아니며, 타인에 의해 시작된 수정에서는 언어 능숙도와 관계없이 전문가 정체성이 쉽게 받아들여지지 않았다.

본 연구의 결과는 비원어민간의 대화의 가치를 증명한다. 즉 그것이 얼마나 자연스럽게 원어민간의 대화만큼이나 정상적인지를 보여준다. 또한 본 연

구결과를 바탕으로 외국어 교사들은 학습자들이 대화에서 어려움을 겪는 상황을 이해하고, 그들의 수정에 대한 인식을 높임으로써 효과적인 대화 수정 능력 향상을 도모할 수 있을 것이다.

주요어: 비원어민, 수정, 대화분석, 교실 밖 제 2 언어 대화

학번: 2008-21567